

**2004 Idaho SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups**  
**Complete Report**  
**By Frank Achana, PhD**

Eight regional Recreation Provider focus groups were conducted this spring and summer as a part of the needs assessment component of Idaho's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan. The aim was to uncover recreation issues of importance as well as unmet community recreation needs around the state. The recreation topics explored in the focus group sessions and the data gathered during the sessions are presented below.

**Question 1.**

- a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?
- b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?

**Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Designate trails for OHVs , and develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks. 13
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies. 8
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning. 7
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Shortage of public recreation facilities. 5
- 5<sup>th</sup>. Improve public recreational water access. 4
- 6<sup>th</sup>. Use the varied attributes of the area to create a regional destination resort. 3
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Education programs are needed to define different recreation opportunities in different settings and their associated land ethic. 2
- 7<sup>th</sup>. More family-oriented youth sports facilities needed. 2
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Variety of camping opportunities with river access needed. 2
- 7<sup>th</sup>. There is a need to emphasize the importance of proper maintenance of the existing infrastructure. 2
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Dependable recreation information source needed by users. 2
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Provide boardwalks and quieter access to wildlife viewing. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. More non-municipal /non-urban parks that are not too far from home are needed. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Need for inter-state cooperation in law enforcement and coordination in recreation management. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Some facilities are needed for the growing sport of Lacrosse. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Proactive management master plans needed for riparian resources, like the Boise river and the Greenbelt. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Off-leash dog parks and trails needed. 1

- 12<sup>th</sup>. Stunt parks that offer challenge adventure experiences are needed. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Interpretation as an outdoor education management tool and as a good interface between the community and the resource, is lacking. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Studies are needed to better understand the recreation and tourism growth potential of the area, and the possible directions for future growth. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Create water trails and moorage facilities for non-motorized water vessels. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Deficient information in southeast Idaho about the availability and accessibility to recreation opportunities. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Shortage of specialized activities. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Inadequate funding for recreation operations. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. ATV activities must be managed in this region because of the presence of grizzly bear recovery areas in some parts of the region. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Introduce an educational course or licensing scheme as a prerequisite to operating ATVs on public lands. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Create reality advertisements that counter the fantasy advertisements of OHV OHV manufacturers, about OHV operation. 1
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Snowmobile maps could serve as models for creating good maps.

### **Details of Responses to Question 1 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

##### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. a. **What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Shortage of public recreation facilities** - Public facilities like restrooms at outdoor recreation sites such as in Forest Service recreation sites. Other facilities needed include toilets, garbage disposal facilities, parking spaces, the hardening of some corridors for moving around. Facilities are often located at places that are very far from where the recreation opportunities are. The growth in recreation is happening without the facilities. For example, at the St. Joe RV park and at the Coeur d'Alene river, they are having to deal with the impacts.
  - ii. **Improve recreational water access** - Complaints come from the Shoshone shoreline for example, where the water body is public but the shoreline is private. Public deep water access is limited as well, and boat ramps have become very crowded partly because water levels have fallen. Parking for participants in boating activities is another very scarce facility. There is a need to improve on the access to the waterfront.
  - iii. **Variety of camping opportunities with river access needed** - The public facilities are lacking for camping in the meadows, for RV weekend camping on the river, and for the transient population or for tubing activities. More land-based camping opportunities are needed
  - iv. **Maintenance of existing infrastructure required** - There is a need to both maintain what infrastructure already exists, as well as create new facilities. Maintenance must include the maintenance of the environment in relation to clean water and other impacts.
  - v. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - Designated areas should be assigned for OHVs, such as recreation trails for racing, so as to get them out of some of the Forest Service trails.
  - vi. **Create water trails and moorage facilities for non-motorized water vessels** - There are no developed water trails for manually powered water vessels. There are not enough non-motorized trails and moorage facilities.
  - vii. **Provide boardwalks and quieter access to wildlife viewing** - More efforts are needed to provide quieter access to wildlife viewing. Boardwalks are some of the facilities needed for this.
- b. **Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

- viii. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** -Partnerships between agencies would be one helpful way of approaching the efficient provision of some of these recreation needs. Given the budget constraints, one agency may own a recreation resource but does not have the resources to develop some of the recreation opportunities that are possible. Another agency may have the services, resources or other ability to make it happen. Collaboration among the agencies may then permit the development of recreation opportunities where they are viable. Counties can propose initiatives and federal agencies can contribute to meeting some of the needs through the facilitation of land acquisition or leasing arrangements.

## **McCall**

### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1.
  - a. **What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - b. **Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**
- i. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - There is a need for trails to be designated for ATV activities. There is a fear that the Forest Service is picking on ATVs and closing access to their activities because of the impacts that the unmanaged activities of some users are having on the resource. However, some older people want to get to the forests for recreation activities and they need to use four-wheelers to get there. This is a big issue in Valley County.
- ii. **Education programs are needed to define different recreation opportunities in different settings and their associated land ethic** - Some people go to, and sometime reside in a rural setting in the hope of leaving behind the restrictions to resource use that they have to endure in urban settings. Education programs are needed to help define what the recreation opportunities are in different settings, what is possible where, what are the access points and the safety issues.
- iii. **More non-municipal /non-urban parks that are not too far from home are needed** -There is a need for more non-municipal parks and recreation areas which, while being non-urban and therefore away from home, do not require two hour drives to access them.

**b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

- i. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - There is a need for a comprehensive and integrated management of ATV activities that includes an educational component. It has been shown that unmanaged ATV activities are having serious negative impacts on wildlife.
- ii. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - Integration at an inter-land management agency level, involving cooperation in designing educational components, using MOUs as legal vehicles of cooperation, and considering public involvement as an essential part of the discussion and decision making process, could bring all ATV management issues together, so that users can better understand why managing these activities is essential. While ATV activities are those that most require an emphasis on integrated management, all other recreation activities would also benefit from an integrated management approach.
- iii. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** - Baker County in Oregon is attempting to connect ATV trails to staging areas. This is one management action that can help control impacts. Multi-agency and multi-jurisdiction connectivity networks are needed for trails, as population growth is fueling the demand for trail use. Funding for trail maintenance should also be given a higher priority.
- iv. **Improve public recreational water access** - Public access to water for recreation is being limited by private land purchases. The agencies involved in land and water management need to get together with interested interest groups to create understandings and MOUs that will allow them to preserve public access to waterfronts and open spaces. The unmet need for close-to-home family recreation in the Treasure Valley would benefit from such efforts.

**Boise**

*Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Need for more accessible open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning** - There is a need for more accessible open spaces. Developers should be providing open space in developments. Also, there needs to be more trail connectivity with open spaces. There should be a way to purchase open space for recreation. The Green belt should be joined/connected to other parks to fulfill all these expectations.
  - ii. **Improve public recreational water access** - Good hard surface access to waterways for fishing, water skiing is needed in the form of boat ramps for

example, particularly on reservoirs where dropping water puts ramps out of the water late in the season.

- iii. **Inter-state cooperation in law enforcement and coordination in recreation management** - There is a need for cooperation in law enforcement and coordination in recreation management between Oregon state and Idaho
- iv. **More family-oriented youth sports facilities needed in the Treasure Valley** - The Treasure Valley is family-oriented and it needs more facilities for youth sports such as soccer and baseball for organized youth activities. There is currently a lot of competition for space for these youth sports facilities. Even if there is a need to travel some distance to access the facilities, that is acceptable, as long as they are available.
- v. **Some facilities are needed for the growing sport of Lacrosse** - Lacrosse is becoming popular and needs some facilities for it.
- vi. **Dependable recreation information source needed by users** - There is a major need for dependable recreation information to be made available to users.
- vii. **Proactive management master plans needed for riparian resources, especially the Boise river and the Greenbelt** -The Boise river and the Greenbelt need a master plan that involves proactive management of the two resources. A broad view is what is required in planning the future of the river.
- viii. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** -The Treasure Valley has pockets of trails here and there, but they lack connectivity. If any one private land owner disagrees about people passing through their land to access other trails, then access to adjoining trails could be cut off. This needs to be addressed to ensure trail connectivity in the valley.
- ix. **Variety of camping opportunities with river access needed** - Overnight camping experiences is a big unmet need in the valley. So are power-boating and moorage needs.
- x. **Off-leash dog parks and trails needed** - Appropriate off-leash parks and trails for dogs are other unmet recreation needs in the valley.
- xi. **Stunt parks that offer challenge adventure experiences are needed** - Adventure experience areas would fulfill a need for such activities. These would include places without trails for free rides using mountain bikes, BMX biking and stunt parks with log obstacles for risk and challenge adventure activities.
- xii. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - When users seek diverse experiences on ATVs in an unmanaged atmosphere, we end up with the kind of mess that we now have at Owyhee, with kids going full throttle on ATVs.

**b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

- xiii. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - Concerning the problem of water access, the maintenance of existing facilities is often the main issue. Partnerships among groups and agencies can help overcome the budget constraints that may be at the root of this problem. If managing agencies target user groups and clubs and

encourage them to donate the time of their members as well as engaging in fund raisers to help maintain the facilities, some progress can be made. BLM is making an effort to protect the environmental settings of recreation sites, while allowing 'things to go with the flow' in terms of the trends in which recreation activities are moving.

## **Pocatello**

### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Deficient information on availability and access to recreation opportunities in southeast Idaho** - Access to public lands is deficient. There is a need for more information in southwest Idaho on what recreation opportunities are available in terms of private and public recreation resources, and the way to access them. We do a good job of identifying potential opportunities. We simply fail to develop access and to give out information about availability.
  - ii. **Education programs are needed to define different recreation opportunities in different settings and their associated land ethic** - There is a real need for educating people on outdoor manners and ethics. Inadequate signage further contributes to the problem.
  - iii. **Shortage of specialized activity areas** - Specialized use areas are needed because there are limited places to participate in some specialized aspects of a sport (mud bogging, for instance)
  - iv. **Shortage of public recreation facilities** - There is a rising trend in which large groups use the outdoors for group functions such as family meetings and reunions. The group facilities are now often the first to be reserved or to fill up in all the spectrums – from urban to rural. The current disperse use and individual use facilities in parks are proving inadequate in meeting those types of needs. Such reunion facilities as pavilions, parking lots and restrooms are in short supply, and more of them would be helpful in urban setting, where the population appears to be increasing at faster rates than the available recreation resources.  
It has to be admitted though that these facilities are however difficult to maintain after they are built.
- b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**
  - v. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - The identification of recreation opportunities has to be collective (inter agency level) and needs to be based on a comprehensive access plan for the region (involving identifying public and private opportunities). The opportunities exist, such as Bear lake

and Bear river, but not much is being done to develop them and make them more easily accessible. For instance, on the Bear River there is an opportunity for floating, but the required easements, acquisition, facilities, infrastructure, and information needed for them to become accessible have not been identified.

- vi. **Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning** - For agricultural land that goes into the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), public access should be written into the deal. If access is blocked across private ground, then the land should not be eligible for the program. This is important because private property owners are coming together and blocking public access to public lands.
- vi. **Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning** - Fish and Game is making some efforts to help create access for some activities with its Access Yes! Program. It could be one of the models to be included in a comprehensive access plan because it involves the private land owners by paying them to provide access to their lands for recreation. Fish & Game has non-permanent annual contracts for access to hunting and they accept bids for the resources that are made available each year by land owners. Similar opportunities on private lands could be bid for, and could include access for other types of recreation. This is particularly critical as access to natural recreation resources is being rapidly lost to private ownership.

For the Forest Service, it is easier to have one-time acquisitions of access to public lands at the time when the surrounding area is being bought up by private owners, than to depend on annual acquisition of rights. This is particularly so since the finances are not always available. But the availability of a varied “bag of tools” to address access needs may be what is needed. These may include model ordinances, incentives offered, easements etc.

- v. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - Regional comprehensive planning of natural resource recreation management is needed. IDPR could take a leading role in regional comprehensive planning, given its role in creating the SCORP. It would require an annual update of achievements and a discussion at that point of what still needs to be done.

## **Challis**

### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** -Single track trails for mountain biking and hiking are in demand. They do not exist on BLM lands, and these are the lands adjacent to towns around here.



- ii. **Interpretation as an outdoor education management tool and as a good interface between the community and the resource, is lacking -**  
Interpretation is lacking in more remote places like ours mostly because it has tended to be concentrated in urban centers. Moderate level skill recreation opportunities that are close-to-home (e.g. two to six mile hiking trails) that include interpretation would serve as a good interface between the community and the resource, while helping, as an outdoor education management tool, to get targeted information to visitors and users. Interpretation could be a good guided OHV trail education tool, for example.

**b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

BLM lands are the ones that are closer-to-home around here, and that is where interpretation could occur. This effort would however need to be a multi-agency one in order to be successful.

**Lewiston**

*Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning -** Access to public lands for recreation activities generally is a big issue around Lewiston, but there is a real need for access for OHVs activities – areas to go and ride.
  - ii. **Use the varied attributes of the area to create a regional destination resort -**  
The Lewiston area has regional destination tourism potential, with increasing programs like fish runs, especially shinouk in the spring. This is a huge draw for visitors. The Dworshak reservoir is where fish issues are critical. River recreation is not what it should be though.
  - iii. **Studies are needed to better understand the recreation and tourism growth potential of the area, and the possible directions of future growth -** Water recreation like dispersed jet boating was intended to be the big deal here. Beyond that however, outdoor recreation in general has taken off. Mountain biking, hiking, deer and elk hunting, kayaking and drift boat fishing have all grown in the last 15 years. People are doing more independent recreation, without relying on the developed parts of the river.  
Not enough studies have however documented the growth and/or why it has occurred, as well as where it could go.
  - i. **Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning -** There is a need to preserve public space in this region, not just to provide public access for current outdoor recreation uses, but also for watershed and farmland protection. Identifying the critical open spaces and acquiring them for current use and for their possible contribution to

ecological stability should be given a higher priority in the Land & Water Conservation Fund grant process. To quote directly from a participant in the focus group session: “Acquisition of prime open spaces ***should move higher in priority in the LWCF grant process. As at now, development of lands has a higher priority in that process than scenic views***” (bolded to indicate the level of emphasis added by the participant).

- iv. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - Cooperation among public and non-governmental entities such as local government authorities (city/county cooperatives/ conservation districts), and public agencies like IDPR, the Forest Service, the Idaho Dept of Fish and Game BLM and the Corps of Army Engineers, could facilitate the acquisition of conservation easements in order to create access to the waterfront for trails, as well as other loops around the city. Hiking, biking and horseback riding all need more trails to meet current demand, and these needs could be addressed through concerted partnership activities. While there are many recreation providers in the area who could work together to address these unmet recreation needs of the area, they are all too preoccupied with their niche area to see the big picture of transforming the whole area into a more attractive destination. IDPR may need to become the coordinator who promotes partnerships among local stakeholders to improve recreation opportunities.
- v. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** - The rails-to-trails program is an example of a good initiative which lacks good enough leadership to proceed. It could benefit from collaboration with other interested groups. In the Lewiston area, there is a need for longer distance hiking, biking and equestrian trail opportunities. There are several rail-to-trail opportunities that could be developed to meet those needs. One would be from Kendrick to Julietta. Another is an Orifino-Pierce-Moscow-Troy trail. There should also be a bike trail from Lewiston to Spalding. Additional trails are needed within the urban settings of Lewiston, and these could be developed along the river and also along the Tamining creek.
- ii. **Use the varied attributes of the area to create a regional destination resort** - The pleasant climate of the Lewiston valley area is another large attraction that brings people to Lewiston. This attribute would make a golf resort feasible, as well as attracting retirement communities and recreational fishing activities. The casino would then be a secondary draw, which can be packaged together with the golf resort. Ancillary recreation facilities must count as important attractions, rather than simply relying on only the primary recreation facilities and attractions. A diversity of facilities and attractions are what create destinations, and a focus on just one type of recreation opportunity may not be sustainable in the end.
- vi. **Shortage of public recreation facilities** - Equestrian recreation activity is a big deal around here and the facilities for this activity (such as trails) need to grow.

- b. **Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**
- ii. **Use the varied attributes of the area to create a regional destination resort -** Creating a destination resort on the Dworshak reservoir, with fishing as the principal recreation activity, could draw in even more visitors, as long as the fish keep coming. Attempts would need to be made to increase the fish runs, or at least maintain consistent runs of fish. These types of investments would require a higher profile for private investment in recreation facilities on public lands to help overcome the funding issue and to create the critical mass of infrastructure development that would firmly establish the identity of the recreation market in the Lewiston valley, bringing in a constant stream of visitors to use the available recreation resources. An expansion of the Dworshak marina or the development of a houseboat marina would be areas in which private concessionaire involvement could spur the development of the needed infrastructure.
- iv. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies -** Communities partnering with the Corps of Army Engineers can preserve watersheds. State agencies should protect scenic views from developers. Cooperative maintenance/development of facilities between all types of providers and users could serve the public good. The IDPR is the agency that is best positioned to pull all the partnerships together to help plan for preservation activities that enhance recreation activities both now and into the future.
- In the Lewiston area, there are opportunities for creek and trail improvements with the Corps of Engineers. The IDPR, the Corps of Army Engineers and user groups could partner together to help clean up paths and trails along the waterways, and contribute to improved hiking experiences. This type of collaborative effort in which government entities work with private groups in partnership in order to overcome some access issues are actually ongoing already. A place where the collaborative effort of recreation providers could come in handy for example is the case where some of the existing trails along the river, such as the pathway to Hells Gate State Park from Lewiston, need to be lighted to enhance safety of use. Grants from recreation providers and state money could allow the Corps of Engineers to do the lighting of those hiking trails.

## **Twin Falls**

### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
- i. **Need for more accessible public open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning -** Neighborhood parks/open spaces are needed because developers are gobbling up the land. These open spaces have the dual purpose of providing space for kids to play, and creating a gathering place.

- ii. **Inadequate funding for recreation operations** - The three percent cap on growth of taxes per year at the County District level makes it difficult to meet adequate recreation operation costs in the Blaine County Recreation District.
- iii. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** - More close-to-home recreation of all kinds are needed. There is a need for more non-motorized trails and connectivity between existing trails. This includes Canyon rim trails. Some land acquisition may be needed for canyon rim trails.  
The right-of-way on the railroad to Shoshone is available for conversion into a rail trail and should be pursued for a recreation trail.
- iv. **More family-oriented youth sports facilities needed** - The changing demographics in the region are making a change in focus in the provision of recreation necessary. Ten years ago, Hispanics were merely a transient population here, but that is no longer the case. Hispanics want soccer fields and open urban spaces to ‘hang out’ in, and for family and organized group activities.
- v. **Improve public recreational water access** - There is a lack of access to the river for non-watercraft activities like hiking, camping, walking, fishing, and hunting.
- vi. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - There is a need for designated places for OHV activities. Facilities for motorized activities are in short supply, and there are conflicts that pitch two wheeler recreationists versus four wheeler recreationists versus RV users. All of these (and especially OHV riders), are looking for facilities that are more family-oriented in which they can teach their kids these types of activities.
- vii. **Shortage of public recreation facilities** - Clubs need community facilities and places to organize urban competitions and activities around population areas, and around the river. Soccer in particular needs outdoor facilities, since it appears to be gaining in popularity, while other urban activities like baseball and basketball are seeing dropping demand. More outdoor swimming facilities are also needed.

**b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

- iii. **Develop trail loops that will create multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional trail connectivity networks** - Non-motorized trail opportunities should be created with a regional big picture focus. They should be planned to connect communities to BLM and Forest Service lands in order to facilitate hiking, biking, etc.
- i. **Need for more accessible open spaces with trail connectivity to be included in urban planning** - Developers should be made to include trails on the roads they build. Blaine County requires that roads and trails that have been open for the public remain so whenever new development comes in. They also have an access map. Counties must get ahead of the issue on access—proactively create planning and zoning ordinances. The Twin Falls Parks and Recreation department has created paved trails to the rim of the Snake river and that is a good example. IDPR should also consider giving counties incentives through the OHV program, to maintain access to public lands. Counties need to designate which roads are county roads. Then when subdivisions of land are sold, the rights of way that

exist in the law must be restated in the purchase agreement, so that both the new owners and the public become aware of them. Blaine County has designated public roads for public access to public lands. Other counties need to follow this lead.

- viii. **Create integrated public recreation management through partnerships and collaboration with other recreation agencies** - Partnerships would be a good way of ensuring that many of these unmet needs are provided. Private/public partnerships as well as those among public recreation providers, clubs, users and within the private sector could all make a contribution toward achieving these goals.

## **Idaho Falls**

### *Greatest Outdoor Recreation Need*

1. **a. What do you believe is the greatest outdoor recreation need in this region (unmet needs)?**
  - i. **Shortage of public recreation facilities** - There is an acute lack of swimming pools in Rexburg. Tennis courts are also generally lacking in this region.
  - ii. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks** - In Fremont County, ATV riders have difficulty following the rules associated with riding ATVs, as the appropriate/designated trails do hardly exist. Most of the roads were designated as Forest Service logging roads. There is no connectivity among them, and so, for example, you cannot get to Mesa Falls and West Yellowstone from Idaho Falls. The only designated trail in Fremont county is a former rail road between the US 20 and the Yellowstone border. This shortage of trails along the US 20 causes most ATV riders to use the burrow pits along the highway corridor. This raises dust that causes a serious driving hazard for motorists along the US 20 highway. Dust abatement is an important safety problem in ATV operations, and it needs to be addressed. Riders also cross the Highway helter-skelter and cause accidents. Currently, there is no grooming system and there is virtually nowhere else to go to ride an ATV except on the roads. The riders end up using forest roads, since they are not allowed on paved roads. That makes the enforcement of ATV regulations very difficult. The lack of designated trails results in complaints by private land owners about trespassing by the ATV riders. The Forest Services sees a need for a trail system in this region especially for ATVs, that would be similar to the snowmobile system. Many trails around here are dead end trails, and there is not enough looping. A system of trails and loops is needed for ATV riders in this region. The Teton basin is an area which has logical connections. ATV trail loops would fit in perfectly, even though the open road density of trails needs to be limited. However, the Forest Service finds it less costly to create trails than to maintain them. Unless there is the financial wherewithal to maintain them, the Forest Service may not find it sustainable to create the trails.

Some of the problems with trails are historical. The USFS created motorized trails for snowmobiles at a time when ATVs were not an issue. Those trails were therefore not designed with ATV use in mind. Even the snowmobiles were originally unable to go much of anywhere and they needed clubs to get the grooming going.

- iii. **Dependable recreation information source needed by users-Old out-of-date and hence inaccurate maps are still in circulation** - The lack of accurate maps complicates the problems of trails. Many old maps are reprinted but are not updated and so, some trails that appear on the Forest Service ATV user guide do not exist on the ground. Other existing trails either cannot be found on the map, or are inaccessible on the ground. As a result, there are a 6 to 1 illegal to legal trail ration in Bighole, as trail pioneering is rampant.
- iv. **Maintenance of existing infrastructure required-Inadequate signage** - There are signage problems on trails, especially on Forest Service lands. More signs are needed. Only a fraction of signs are replaced when they break. Montana's ATV laws are stricter than those of Idaho, with helmets and Montana rider license fees required. Hence there is no reciprocity for Idaho-based riders. Consequently, despite the trail limitations around here and the existence of good trails in Montana, their trails are not a readily accessible alternative resource for riders in this region.
- v. **Designate trails for OHVs with loops to form networks –Eliminate the seasonal (summer) closures of some trails to increase opportunities** - Another problem is the fact that some trails are open in the winter time but then they are closed in the summer time, further limiting access to possible trails. Most people with cabins in this area rent ATVs. They are typically not experienced riders and so they do damage to the forest.
- vi. **ATV activities need to be managed in this region because of the presence of grizzly bear recovery areas in some parts of the region** - There is grizzly bear recovery area in some parts of the region and the uncontrolled use of ATVs can negatively impact such programs. The activities of ATV riders will therefore have to be reined in somehow and brought under some form of management.

**b. Who do you believe should meet/address this need, and how can that best be done?**

- vii. **Introduce an educational course or licensing scheme as a prerequisite to operating ATVs on public lands** - Montana has an educational course that potential ATV users must take before they are allowed to operate ATVs on public lands. This is a good way of ensuring that ATV users are informed of operational safety and ethical land use policies. Similar licensing programs should also be instituted in Idaho, as prerequisites for operating ATVs. The caveat here should be that guidelines be made available to parents who want to supervise ATV operations by their unlicensed children. The parents should then be held accountable for their children's ATV operations. While the joint

family use of ATVs should not be discouraged, the current practice of some parents who use the ATV like the TV, as a babysitters should be discouraged. Some Sheriff officers (such as one from Fremont county at this focus group session), are willing to organize educational programs to teach skills in ATV use. Such programs could help dissipate the mistaken perception that the operation of an ATV is less risky than, say, motorcycles. Most snowmobilers use helmets while many ATV riders do not, and it appears that that perception is to blame. Educational programs should indicate that helmets are part of a package deal when ATVs or motorbikes are purchased.

- viii. **Create reality advertisements that counter the fantasy advertisements of manufacturers, about OHV operation** - There is a need for reality advertisements to be put out there to counter the unrealistic, advertisements of OHV manufacturers, which do not caution about appropriate land ethics and operational safety and responsible use. Some ATV dealers often give the impression to their clients that the public lands are there for the ATV riders to use, without any simultaneous cautioning about the responsibilities involved in such use. They should be advised to give more complete information to their clients. Perhaps a dealer certification program in which all these issues are satisfactorily address could be part of the answer.
- ix. **Snowmobile maps could serve as models for creating good maps** - The snowmobile maps are very good, as they highlight major features and are easy to understand. They could be useful model that would be instructive for the creation of maps for other uses.  
GPS mapping is now available to the Forest Service and they expect this to allow them to clean up the old maps.
- x. **Conclusion** - The experience of the Forest Service is that the creation of 14 foot wide groomed trails reduced off trail use issues because it caters to all ATV users. What is needed at Fremont county is an ATV trail system with loops that allows riders to go from A to B and back.

- Question 2** – a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho  
b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?

**Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Conflicts among different recreationists sharing a resource. 5
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Narrowness of the missions of individual land management agencies and their funding source-driven priorities ignores other possible recreation opportunities. 3
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Lack of consistent and appropriate signage practices and other regulations at public recreation sites needed. Statewide default position needed on designation of routes and trails as open or closed. 3
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Education and marketing – A need to sell recreation to decision makers and the public. 3
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. A need for coordination of recreation providers' activities. 3
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unfunded and hardly managed dispersed recreation sites. 3
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Lack of a consistent statewide approaches to OHV use on public lands. 2
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Lack of a centralized inter-agency information website. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Lack of templates of measurement/recommended measures of recreation needs per population base. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Geocaching is beginning to pose a problem of resource damage. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A need to institute rescue insurance to reduce the burden of rescue costs on local authorities. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Vandalism 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Lack of carrying capacity information, and peak use time information for recreation sites. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Lack of funding for non-motorized recreation compared to motorized recreation. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Need for IDPR to Make its good recreation facilities and/or expertise more available to other recreation providers (or within the IDPR system). 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Private land purchases limiting public access to water for recreation. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Outdated/inappropriate campsite facilities. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Trail pioneering. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Need for more data gathering and analysis. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Neglect of maintenance. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Lands Department cannot regulate public recreational use on endowment lands. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Inadequate land acquisition leading to loss if some of the best lands to developers. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Group campgrounds needed in places like Hells Gate. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A trail statewide trail system coordinator is needed. 1



## **Details of Responses to Question 2 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

### **CDA**

#### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Inconsistent approaches to OHV use rules** - No consistent approach to OHV use on public lands.
- ii. **Inconsistent signage at recreation sites of different public land management agencies** - The flip-flop among public land management agencies between “Closed unless designated as open” and “Open unless designated as closed” is confusing.
- iii. **Narrow missions of Land management agencies ignore possible recreation opportunities** - The narrowness of the missions of individual land management agencies (especially the federal ones) causes them to ignoring other possible recreation opportunities.

#### **b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- i. **Consistent statewide approaches to OHV use on public lands required** - Need for statewide consistent approaches to OHV use on public lands.
- ii. **Consistent signage and default designation of Open” or “Closed” trails/routes needed** - A statewide default position is needed on how to designate routes and trails as open or closed. It would help if signage is harmonized across all public land management agency recreation sites.
- iii. **Partnership among federal, state and private providers to offer comprehensive recreation opportunities** - IDPR and other state land agencies should attempt to create more comprehensive recreation opportunities by dialoguing with, and going into partnerships with the Federal land management agencies and private providers using methods like MOUs. This can complement the recreation opportunities by filling in the recreation opportunity gaps

### **McCall**

#### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Lands Department cannot regulate public recreational use on endowment lands** – Lands Department. is supposed to manage endowment lands to maximize profit. But these lands are supposed to be open for public recreational use, and the dept. has no power to make regulations restricting public recreational use. So recreation regulations by other agencies displace people to endowment lands, causing impacts.  
Partnerships with other agencies whereby the lands for the Lands Department are leased for recreation infrastructure could be a win-win proposal.

- ii. **Funding constituencies of land management agencies drive their priorities** - Funding constituencies of land management agencies drive their priorities (hunting, fishing and logging for the Forest Service for example). So other recreation opportunities are not invested in. Idaho Fish and Game is focused on fishing and hunting opportunities, and great 'watchable' wildlife opportunities are ignored due to the narrow scope of their grant programs. Eventually, the promoted activities impact and degrade the neglected opportunities, such as dispersed recreation sites that are neither funded nor managed.
- iii. **Unfunded and hardly managed dispersed recreation sites** - No serious funding or management of dispersed recreation sites. Again recreation activities that produce more revenue appear to be in the driver's seat.
- iv. **Private land purchases limiting public access to water for recreation** - Public access to water is being limited by private purchases. Boise Cascade land is being pushed off.

**b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- v. **Narrowness of the missions of individual land management agencies** - Land management agencies should make a joint effort to seek General Fund support to broaden the missions of agencies to cover more recreation activities.

**Boise**

*Outdoor Recreation Problems*

**2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Conflicts among different recreationists sharing a resource** - Conflicts between motorcyclists (want narrow trails) and ATV user, who want wider ones. Also, motorcyclists, snowmobilers and cross-country skiers cannot get along.
- ii. **Templates of measurement of recreation needs per population base are lacking** - No recommended standards of acres of recreation areas per population base exist to guide master plans for new urbanizations. The result is the reinvention of the wheel each time as new areas get urbanized.
- iii. **Lack of a centralized inter-agency information website** - There is no centralized inter-agency information website providing information on available recreation facilities in the state irrespective of who manages them.
- iv. **Outdated campsite facilities** - While the camping public has changed over the years (SUV rather than small cars, need for electricity, web access etc. at campsites), many sites have become antiquated.
- v. **Trail pioneering** - Trail pioneering encroaches on prime habitat and private land owners complain of trespassing.
- vi. **Lack of carrying capacity and peak use time information for recreation sites** - The carrying capacity of recreation sites and their peak use times are not clarified.

**b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- i. **User conflicts – Provide separate trails for different users and leverage education programs in schools to teach recreation site tolerance** - Wherever possible, separate trails should be created for different recreation users. In the schools, outdoor recreation is scoring big with kids in such activities as backpacking, mountain biking, kayaking and hiking. We can leverage education programs on outdoor recreation and environmental ethics to reduce conflicts and improve risk awareness.
- i. **Encourage conflicted user dialogue for conflict resolution** - Education programs alone will not do the job. There is a need to encourage meetings and consultations among conflicting user groups to discuss conflicts, while encouraging self policing and positive peer pressure within user groups.
- ii. **IDPR as a catalyst for establishing recommended standards of acres of recreation areas per population base** - IDPR should serve as a catalyst for establishing templates of measurement of recreation needs per population base. Corporations should also be encouraged to allow public access to their campuses for such recreation activities as walking and biking in the mornings and weekends, when their employees are not using them.
- iii. **Establish centralized inter-agency information website** - Model for this kind of information statewide integration has a model in the community tool box in Oregon's website for SCORTP. It is also attempted on state by state basis in Publiclands.org and Recreation.gov.
- vii. **Use the price mechanism to manipulate peak time use** - The price mechanism can be used, especially in Ada county parks, to manipulate peak time use of recreation sites (higher fees during peak times).

**Pocatello**

*Outdoor Recreation Problems*

**2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Promote recreation opportunities on private lands to complement those on public lands** - There is no land trust in southeastern Idaho. So the current attitude of public recreation agencies of overlooking the possible recreation opportunities of private lands as part of the recreation supply.
- ii. **Unfair burden of recreation rescue costs on local authorities** - Local authorities are being unfairly burdened with rescue costs of recreation accidents.

**b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- ii. **Need to institute rescue insurance to reduce burden on local authorities** - Rescue insurance needs to be instituted for users. Refer to a recent National Geographic Magazine for an explanation of the concept.

## **Challis**

### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Unmanaged OHV use** - Unmanaged OHV use (especially ATV hunters) is a huge source of resource damage and disturbance of the activities of other recreationists. The ATV hunters are a big problem on BLM lands in the region that includes Challis. Erratic use of ATVs in general (rather than at designated sites) is rampant.
- ii. **Inconsistent signage practices and other regulations** - Too many varied regulations governing recreation based on who manages the site. This is confusing to users who just want a consistent set of rules to guide their recreation activities, and are not concerned about which authority is involved.
- iii. **Geocaching beginning to pose a problem of resource damage** - Geocaching is beginning to pose a problem by creating converging pioneering trails that impact the resources. Participation appears to be spread out across different types of recreationists like hikers, bikers, horseback riders etc., even though hikers appear to be the main generic group that does geocaching. There are also a hardcore geocaching groups for whom that is the principal activity, and they use complex gadgetry like GPS technology in the process.

#### **b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- i. **Harmonize recreation rules on all public land management recreation sites** - An effort should be made to harmonize the set of rules in all recreation areas statewide irrespective of the type of management or agency involved, to facilitate both compliance and law enforcement.
- ii. **Involve all stakeholders in enforcing recreation regulations** - All stakeholders should be involved in helping to enforce recreation regulations, and it should not be left to sheriffs alone. For example, groups like dealerships and recreation clubs should be encouraged (even given incentives) to get engaged in facilitating the enforcement of recreation rules.
- iv. **Inter-stakeholder partnership needed to educate users on appropriate resource use** – The resource management agencies should partner with the other stakeholders to publish booklets educate users on appropriate use. The “Tread lightly” land ethic program is an example of good steps taken in that direction.
- iii. **Encouraging “virtual geocaching” to reduce impacts** - Encouraging “virtual geocaching”, where nothing is left behind, may help reduce resource impacts. Requiring that access be only on foot, and promoting guided geocaching tours are other possible methods of mitigating damage that the activity could cause to the resource.

## **Lewiston**

### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Coordination of recreation providers' activities needed to promote collaboration** - A coordinating body of recreation providers is needed in the region to organize collaboration among providers in recreation problem solving. IDPR is well positioned to make that happen.
- ii. **Lack of funding to build specialized facilities** - Lack of funding to build specialized facilities like campgrounds for fishing or different other activities. The lack of sufficient facilities to accommodate the users of group facilities, is a major problem.
- iii. **Inadequate land acquisition leads to loss of best lands to developers** - The best lands are being gobbled up by private developers. Lack of the wherewithal and the sponsors to acquire lands for park development, and the lack of expertise to assist with the acquisition, e.g., rail-to-trail acquisition.
- iv. **Non-motorized recreation not getting enough funding** - Non-motorized recreation is not getting the attention that motorized recreation is getting. There is a need for equal effort to be made to give users of both types of recreation equal access to facilities.

#### **b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- iv. **Diversify funding sources for land acquisition for recreation** - Need to look for diversified funding sources and staff expertise for land acquisition for recreation could help in the provision of recreation facilities. State agencies can act as catalysts by sponsoring the initial work required to develop public access to trails for example, and then seek outside support.
- v. **Group campground needed at Hells Gate**- Hells Gate State park needs a group campground to satisfy the demand for such a facility at that site.
- vi. **Trail systems coordinator needed** - A statewide coordinator of trail systems is needed with the responsibility of assisting the regions to develop linear parks and trail systems, together with their local, regional and statewide connectivity loops.

## **Twin Falls**

### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Conflicts among different recreationists sharing a resource** - Conflicts among different trail users arise out of the competition for space among different types of recreation users. The coincidence in the same time and recreation space of users with different skill levels, of large groups of users running into individual or smaller groups of users, and the differences in social attitudes among users, sows the seeds for conflicts on the trails. Examples include snowmobilers versus skiers,

and tourists who think they have arrived in 'lalaland' and feel safe to ride carelessly on roads without regard to any rules.

- i. **Conflicts among different recreationists - Changing demographics and the emergence of non-traditional recreation needs** - Growing urbanization and changing demographics (aging of the population and cultural diversification of the population) may create recreation needs that conflict with the traditional Idaho image that some may have of having a legitimate right to use all public lands for outdoor recreation without any restrictions. This disconnect between past and present attitudes are often present on urban trails, producing conflicting needs. Recreation administrators may misunderstand the newer trends in user needs and benefits, and may contribute to users conflicts by their actions.
- ii. **Vandalism and facility wear and tear** - Vandalism, involving the shooting and tearing down of signs, and the destruction of such facilities as toilets are a problem.
- iii. **Neglect of maintenance** - Funding for maintenance is often more difficult to obtain than funding to build up the facilities. The revenue generating role of maintenance is not immediately obvious.

**b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- i. **Use of user group peer pressure to get compliance with rules and respect the rights of other recreationists** - Existing local recreation user groups and clubs should be brought into the discussion to create peer pressure on user groups members regarding the need to follow rules and respect the rights of other recreationists, as well as getting conflicted groups to talk to each other to solve problems.
- i. **Fund Mediation as a conflict resolution method** - Mediation should perhaps become a fundable request since it facilitates interaction and a better understanding among different user groups about what impacts the quality of recreation of all user groups. Mediation was successful in solving snowmobile users versus cross-country skiers conflicts in Blaine county.
- i. **Education programs to reduce user conflicts** - Education programs tailored to different user groups and providing awareness about the interests of other user groups can help reduce conflicts.
- ii. **IRPA marketing the value of recreation to decision makers** - The IRPA should do a legislative day each year to educate decision makers on the important role recreation plays in the wellbeing of their constituents.
- ii. **Selling recreation to decision makers and the public** - Marketing of the benefits of recreation can be improved. The YMCA is able to tell stories of such benefits and use video clips and testimonials to successfully market their recreation programs. Outdoor recreation agencies should be able to do likewise.
- iii. **Data gathering needed** - Data gathering, qualitative and quantitative, and the publishing of the results can motivate outdoor recreation constituencies. The use of the less dense fiberglass signs reduces their vulnerability to vandalism.

## **Idaho Falls**

### *Outdoor Recreation Problems*

#### **2. a. Major Problems Regarding Outdoor Recreation in Idaho**

- i. **Wild West ‘no rules’ recreation mentality** - The old Wild West ‘no rules’ mentality drives the problems of ATV impacts in southeast Idaho. Users appear to feel that ATVs can go wherever horses can go.  
The result is wilderness trespassing. When Utah reinforced its ATV regulations, some of these Wild West riders were displaced to Wyoming.
- ii. **Consistent and appropriate signage practices** - Inadequate funding for signage at recreation sites is also a problem. In putting up signs, trail rangers end up putting stickers on too many trees, defacing them.
- iii. **Hardly managed dispersed recreation sites** - Dispersed camping is evolving into big trailer/motor home camping that is undoing the dispersed or less developed character of this type of camping. Such sites are becoming ‘virtual’ developed sites, and yet they lack the necessary hardened surfaces for such locations. Even though the trailers may be self-contained, the human waste problems are incredible.

#### **b. How Would You Go About Solving Those Problems?**

- i. **Staggered enforcement** - A two year grace period in which an emphasis on education as a means of correcting the Wild West mentality could be followed by an intensive week of heavy-handed enforcement, including the use of helicopters. When one local person is cited, everyone knows about it by evening. Then normal enforcement can follow that exercise.

- Question 3**
- a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?
  - b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?

**Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

**Important products/facilities/services offered by IDPR:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities (or within the IDPR system). 7
- 1<sup>st</sup>. Grants for funding recreation projects. 7
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Coordination of inter-agency recreation planning statewide. 4
- 4<sup>th</sup>. IDPR as a resource for education on recreation. 1

**Products, services or facilities that IDPR does not offer but that I would like to see offered in the future:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities (or within the IDPR system). 7
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Establish an accessible one-stop source of information (possibly a web-based). 5
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Lobby for and market recreation to the public and to decision makers to inform people of recreation opportunities and to improve funding. 5
- 4<sup>rd</sup>. Lack of funding for non-motorized recreation. 3
- 4<sup>rd</sup>. Seek new grants and other funding sources for recreation projects. 3
- 6<sup>th</sup>. More emphasis on the coordination of inter-agency recreation planning statewide 2
- 7<sup>th</sup>. It should be made possible for IDPR grant money to be used for facility rehabilitation. 1
- 7<sup>th</sup>. IDPR should lead the way to promote the formulation of consistent recreation regulations statewide at the recreation sites of all land management agencies. 1
- 7<sup>th</sup>. The maintenance of existing parks and recreation system, and ensuring that they remain financially accessible to all should be a major priority of IDPR. 1.



### **Details of Responses to Question 3 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

##### *The Contribution of IDPR*

3.      **a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
- i.    **Grants for funding recreation projects** - The grant program is the most important one.
  - ii.   **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide** - The SCORTP process is extremely useful from a strategic planning perspective for us.
  - iii.   **Resource for Education on Recreation** - The Education resources program is one of the most important.
  - iv.   **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide** - This current focus group process facilitates the coordination of efforts for the provision of recreation.
- b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**
- i.    **Grants for funding recreation projects** - IDPR could improve the provision of recreation by seeking and providing more funding options. Some central recreation matching funding source for state agencies seeking to improve recreation opportunities could be created. Much is recreation development driven by the availability of funding.  
Funding sources like foundations could be approached. Federal or state funds are often left floating in one region, and may even end up being returned to the government unused at the end of the fiscal year, when they are badly needed in another region. IDPR could become a central clearing house for redirecting such funds when they are earmarked for recreation; so that they are used to fund recreation programs in the parts of the state where there is a lack of funding for such programs.
  - v.    **Lobby for and market recreation to the public and decision makers to inform people of recreation opportunities and to improve funding – political influence** - If priorities are clearly established and the recreation needs are identified, it should be possible to influence local and national level political entities to provide the necessary funding for those basic recreation needs.
  - vi.   **Establish an accessible one-stop source of information – education** (possibly a web-based) - Helpful for the education aspect. These sources of information could be customized/localized on a regional basis to make them more relevant to the area where they are sought.
  - vii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities – facility building** - The IDPR has the technical expertise to

- run camping program in the public lands owned by other agencies. So why not come to agreements in which the services of the staff of the IDPR are used to create RV parks and other camping facilities on the lands of the other agencies (partnerships). The Fish and Game agency could, for example, designate an area as a RV park, and IDPR can then develop the park.
- vi. **Establish an accessible one-stop source of information – maps** (possibly a web-based) – Ensuring the provision of such information as maps close to the points of contact at which recreationists make contact with the providers of recreation.
  - vii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities – skills development** (or within the IDPR system) - There are lots of opportunities for canoe routes, wildlife watching etc. that the IDPR could develop. They can also develop education tools to encourage the respect of wildlife.
  - v. **Lobby for and market recreation to the public and decision makers to inform people of recreation opportunities and to improve funding – raising awareness** - The IDPR can do a marketing job of raising the awareness of people to the availability of recreation opportunities.

## McCall

### *The Contribution of IDPR*

3. **a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
  - i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities** (or within the IDPR system) - The boating facilities of IDPR are very helpful to Fish and Game.
- b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**
  - i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities** (or within the IDPR system) - A fish cleaning facility will be needed for the Cascade in the next five years. Blueprints for such a facility are available in Fish and Game.
  - ii. **Establish an accessible one-stop source of information** (possibly a web-based) - An integrated (centralized) data collection process for all land management agencies in Idaho would make such data available to all agencies, and encourage collaboration in research while reducing duplication. The office of Species Conservation may serve as a model in this.
  - iii. **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide** - An outreach program by IDPR is needed for recreation planning and management assistance to other land management agencies.

## Boise

### *The Contribution of IDPR*

3.
  - a. **What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
    - i. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - The grants programs of IDPR is a big contribution to the success of our activities.
    - ii. **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide** - The SCORTP planning program creates a common goal for agencies involved in recreation in the state.
    - iii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities** (or within the IDPR system) - IDPR creates recreation opportunities in the Corp of Engineers facilities and that adds a lot of value to them.
  - b. **What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**
    - i. **Grants for funding recreation projects – one size fits all** - While the grants program are not too complex, the universal nature of the criteria makes them a bit of a “one size fits all” program. More flexibility is needed in criteria in order to accommodate specific circumstances.
    - i. **Allow grant money for facility rehabilitation** - While the funds provided by the grant system can generally be used for mitigation issues, it appears that they cannot be used for rehabilitation of facilities. That does not make sense since the facilities could then disintegrate.
    - ii. **Lack of funding for non-motorized recreation** - The grant program does not serve the goals of non-motorized recreation very well. This, however, is the area which has less possibilities of supporting itself through user fees. Perhaps the fuel tax revenue should be stretched to cover some of the needs of non-motorized recreation.
    - iii. **Lobby for and market recreation to the public and decision makers to inform people of recreation opportunities and to improve funding – urban education** - Rapid urbanization is converting some rural parks into urban ones. IDPR should capitalize on these circumstances to use the parks as education opportunities for urban residents.
    - iv. **Establish an accessible one-stop source of information** (possibly a web-based) - The IDPR could host a centralized website for recreation opportunities in Idaho, or at least carry links to the websites of other agencies whose activities include catering to recreationists.
    - v. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities – more yurts** (or within the IDPR system) - More yurts are needed. They are particularly good for families with kids, and they help cut down on what one needs to carry from home out there.

## **Pocatello**

### *The Contribution of IDPR*

3. **a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
  - i. **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide** - Regional planning.
  - b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**
  - ii. **Lack of funding for non-motorized recreation** - Funding is lacking for non-motorized recreation activities. Sun Valley charged access fees but had to cut the fees in half as they were very unpopular.
  - iii. **Lobby for and market recreation to the public and decision makers to inform people of recreation opportunities and to improve funding - environmental ethics** - There is a need for more money to be spent in marketing outdoor recreation (and environmental) ethics. Schools should be some of the prime targets for such messages.

A package of resource etiquette information should be created for all resource recreation user groups such as horse riders, motorized and non-motorized users. In Wyoming, an education package is available to provide information to the public and to children on outdoor recreation ethics, and it works. All user groups contribute to the collaboration effort.
  - iv. **Establish an accessible one-stop source of information - repository of recreation opportunities** - (possibly a web-based) - There is a need for one repository of recreation opportunities in Idaho, and IDPR could create a website which includes the recreation opportunities in Idaho in the lands of such agencies as Forest Service, the BLM, the Idaho Fish and Game, and the Department of Lands. Their documentation on such issues as land use ethics and access regulations could also be included in the repository.

## **Challis**

### *The Contribution of IDPR*

3. **a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
  - i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - trail rangers program** – (or within the IDPR system) - The state trail rangers program is great for the Forest Service.
  - i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - interpretation professionals** (or within the IDPR system) - IDPR interpretation professionals through the LOYF interpretation program and program grants are also very helpful to the Forest Service, by supporting our

- interpreters and engaging in aspects of interpretation in which the Forest Service lacks expertise.
- iii. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - The grants program of IDPR helps the Forest Service to embark on certain major projects that would be impossible otherwise.
  - b. **What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**
  - iv. **Promoting consistent recreation regulation statewide at the recreation sites of all land management agencies** - The promotion of consistent regulations similar to those achieved with boating, and enforcement agreements across agencies on the issues related to ATV use, are areas that IDPR could do more to make recreation activities more enjoyable in Idaho.

### **Lewiston**

#### *The Contribution of IDPR*

- 3.a. **What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**
  - i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities** – (or within the IDPR system) - IDPR's role of developing recreation opportunities in the lands of other recreation providers is very important. It helps fill out the spectrum of opportunities available. "BLM sees IDPR's provision of recreation activities on our lands as complementing our non-developed recreation opportunities. IDPR provides the needed developed campgrounds so that users do not spill over into non-developed grounds".
  - ii. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - IDPR assists smaller cities and communities develop their own parks and opportunities (city of Moscow), through the use of the grant process. It provides technical assistance to smaller communities on park and recreation issues.
  - iii. **Maintain the existing park and recreation system, and keep it financially accessible to all** - IDPR needs to rev up the maintenance of the existing park and recreation system, and keep it financially accessible to all. People are complaining of the cost and accessibility. Park access should be free even though campgrounds should charge fees. The complaints are particularly about paying for day use of the parks. You should be able to use the day facility for free.
  - ii. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - The LWCF and other maintenance funds and programs like the Waterways Improvement Fund, Snowmobile and ORMV funds are a huge boon for other recreation provider agencies, making good contributions statewide.

**3.b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**

- ii. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - I would like to see an expansion of such maintenance funds as the Waterways Improvement Fund, Snowmobile and ORMV funds to cover non-motorized boats as well.
- iii. **Coordination of Inter-agency Recreation Planning statewide – national trails** - IDPR should promote the establishment of a statewide trail system in order to promote the ‘Healthy living’ idea. There will be more people wanting to exercise if the trail system is improved statewide, given that the healthy living idea has grown in the last 15 years, and IDPR should take a leading role in the overall coordination of the creation and maintenance of a regional trail system, leveraging the grant system.
- i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - trails** (or within the IDPR system) - A trail from Lewiston to Potlatch River to Kendrick could be part of a regional trail system in this region. Each regional trail would eventually connect together to become a statewide trail.  
A good model for the regional and statewide trail system would be Minnesota. The Minnesota State Parks Division led the creation of the trail system. It started by supervising the snowmobile trails. Then it coordinated the establishment of regional trails and worked to ensure their connectivity to the parks.
- i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - urban greenways** (or within the IDPR system) - IDPR should also get more involved in the development of urban greenways and in other developments along them.  
IDPR could be a resource and a coordinator on how to develop these resources.

**Twin Falls**

*The Contribution of IDPR*

**3.a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**

- i. **Grants for funding recreation projects** - The partnerships created through the administration of grant funding, especially the LWCF grants.
- ii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities – information** (or within the IDPR system) - Information on the website is useful.
- ii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - cultural recreation** (or within the IDPR system) - The cultural recreation sites that IDPR provides are good.

**b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**

- iii. **Lack of funding for non-motorized recreation** - There is a need to do more to support the non-motorized side of the recreation equation.
- ii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - RV parks** (or within the IDPR system) - There is a lack of RV parks in this area/region. RVs come here but there are no facilities to serve them.
- ii. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities - cultural recreation** (or within the IDPR system) - Even though the cultural recreation sites that IDPR provides are good they need to be given more attention and emphasis.

### **Idaho Falls**

#### *The Contribution of IDPR*

**3.a. What is the most important service, product or facility that the Idaho Dept of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) offers to you?**

- i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities** – The following IDPR programs are big hits for the US Forest Service:
  - The trail CAT program
  - The trail rangers program
  - The RTP and other grant programs are absolute life savers for the U.S. Forest Service.

**b. What service, product or facility does the IDPR not offer that you would like to see offered in the future?**

- i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities more CAT programs** – We would like to have more CAT programs in other parts of the region, like Island Park. Fremont county also needs grooming sheds for snowmobiles. In 1992, Driggs had six people on trails. An education component is needed for these activities. Funding for sheriff Enforcement is another absolute necessity.
- i. **IDPR should make their expertise available to other providers to create recreation facilities – grooming machines** – Snow machine grooming is inadequate to non-existent in this region. In Wyoming, this function is contracted out and the state pays the contractors.
- ii. **Lack of outreach to all possible patrons** - There are not many women in outdoor skills activities in this region. This may be an area that needs priority attention in terms of programs.

## **SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups**

**Question 4** – How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers hunters etc.*

### **Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Downward hierarchy of tolerance among land-based trail users – balkanization of trail users. 3
- 1<sup>st</sup>. Getting groups together to discuss their disagreements can sometimes lead to more acceptable solutions to their differences. 3
- 1<sup>st</sup>. Designate segregated areas for different recreation activities. 3
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Set the expectations about the other types of users likely to be sharing multiple use resource, through educational techniques and signage. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Perennial polarization between motorized and non-motorized recreationists. and lack of consistent operation guidelines and trail designation information foster conflict. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. A comprehensive education outreach program can, at least, minimize conflicts. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Encourage self-policing through grassroots groups to improve rule enforcement. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Recreation providers should work out ‘common ground’ rules of operation. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Cross country skiers versus snowmobilers. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Conflict between ATV hunters and non-ATV using hunters. 2
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Tensions between boaters and swimmers. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. The “how” of access to the public lands should be viewed as a privilege and not a right. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. The activities of one recreation group impacting the quality, the success or the safety of the activities of another may cause tensions. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. A “tourist takeover” fear by local residents can cause tensions. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Destination tourism diversifying away from resource-based economies and toward multiple use of resources may generate conflict with entrenched values. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Conflict between jet skiers and other boaters. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Recreation activities occurring near population centers generate bigger conflicts than in more remote areas. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Inter-generational and intercultural tensions get manifested in recreation activities. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Organized groups versus non-organized groups of users. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>. The provision of more access for motorized recreation could meet the



- surging demand and reduce conflicts. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Connectivity of trails reduces switching back on the same trails - and meeting other users coming from the opposite direction. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.OHV hunters versus recreationists on foot and on horseback. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.More enforcement for motorized user constraints could reduce tensions. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Involve user groups in planning facilities and programs to catch conflicts early. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Resource managers need to have guiding principles indicating the ultimate outcome ideas that guide their decision-making, especially in resolving conflicts. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Resource managers should beware of quick fixes under political pressure on issues of conflict. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.The use of social science research by IDPR to study the issues surrounding conflict in recreation is a good idea. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Mountain bikers versus ATV users. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Mountain bikers versus hikers. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Backcountry skiers versus snowmobilers. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Encourage stickers for dog sledges. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Extreme skiers versus traditional backcountry skiers. 1
- 11<sup>th</sup>.Speed differential conflicts, even among non-motorized recreationists.

## SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups

### Details of Responses to Question 4 in each Region

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

#### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

4. **When diverse recreationists jointly use the same recreation sites/ resources, how well do they get along in this region?**
  - i. **Tensions between boaters and swimmers** - Tensions exist between boaters and swimmers, (especially with small boaters). Possible need to designate different areas for different water-related recreationists.
  - ii. **Downward hierarchy of tolerance among land-based trail users based on level of motorization** - There appears to be a hierarchy of tolerance among land-based trail users when it comes to who they are willing to tolerate as co-users of the trails. The hierarchy of tolerance of other recreation users who jointly use the same resource appears to follow a norm of a willingness to share downward with less motorized users than oneself. Heavy machine using recreationists do not appear to mind sharing the resource with virtually any other type of recreationist. Slightly motorized users, while being willing to share the resource with both their peers and non-motorized users, tend to resent the users of heavier machines. It can be difficult to manage any type of segmentation of use.
  - iii. **The “how” of access to the public lands should be viewed as a privilege and not a right** - Some users think that it is their right to use public land as they see fit, without any restrictions. So ATV users in Shoshone county are railing against certain trail closures as a matter of right. The policy should however be that everyone has a right to be present on public lands, but that the “how” of the access to the public lands is a privilege and not a right.
  - iv. **The activities of one recreation group impacting the quality, the success or the safety of the activities of another may cause tensions** - Sources of tension often emanate from a quest for quality hunting, quality wildlife viewing and issues related to safety (ensuring that the activities of one group does not jeopardize the safety of other recreationists).
  - v. **A “tourist takeover” fear by local residents can cause tensions** -The objections of local residents to a “tourist takeover” of their recreation opportunities is often another source of tension (The “I can no longer go fishing because there are tourists everywhere” mentality).
  - vi. **Destination tourism diversifying away from resource-based economies and toward multiple use of resources may generate conflict with entrenched values** - The opposite end of the last argument occurs where destinations are diversifying away from resource-based economies to tourism-based economies

can create tensions and frictions. Here, (as is the case for Shoshone county), support for tourism is quite high and the need to manage resource use diversification and consequent multiple use of resources by a variety of recreationists is important and requires careful planning.

## **McCall**

### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

4. **When diverse recreationists jointly use the same recreation sites/resources, how well do they get along in this region?**
  - i. **Conflict between ATV hunters and non-ATV using hunters** - There is a conflict between ATV hunters and non-ATV using hunters, and this is the number one complaint of recreationists at Fish and Game. The ATV hunters generate noise, harass wildlife, use the ATVs at unauthorized places, and also get the unfair advantage of beating non-ATV hunters to the Game. “The noisier recreationists win” in this case. Hikers also feel harassed by the ATV users. ATV hunters incidentally favor some restrictions on ATV operations, such as the banning of off-road ATV use, except for game retrieval.
  - ii. **Conflict between jet skiers and other boaters** - Another complaint/conflict cluster is the one between jet skiers and other boaters. Noise again is the issue that generates the complaints. Personal Water Craft complaints at Ponderosa are some of the principal complaints. They ply close to shore because they ‘need’ an audience, and recreationists on the IDL lands get impacted.
  - iii. **Cross country skiers versus snowmobilers** - Cross country skiers are impacted by snowmobilers but the the snowmobilers do not feel impacted by the cross country skiers.
  - iv. **Downward hierarchy of tolerance - Motorized recreationists negatively impact non-motorized recreationists through noise and extra risks** - Generally, it appears that the motorized recreationists negatively impact non-motorized recreationists through excessive noise and the introduction of extra safety risks. Additionally, horseback riders complain about the impacts of bikers on their activity. However, a participant stated that he rarely encounters a problem with bikes when riding horses out there.
  - v. **Recreation activities occurring near population centers generate bigger conflicts than in more remote areas** - Another general effect is that the closer the recreation activities occur near population centers, the bigger the conflicts they generate, as more amateurs and renters of equipment \*operate in these locations. On the streets in Cascade, these problems occur with motorized recreation vehicles.
  - vi. **A comprehensive education outreach program can at least, minimize conflicts** - The need to counter these conflicts is another indication of a need for a comprehensive education outreach program, even though such a program would most probably only improve rather than solve the whole problem of conflicts.

## **Boise**

### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

4. **When diverse recreationists jointly use the same recreation sites/resources, how well do they get along in this region?**
  - i. **Conflict between ATV hunters and non-ATV using hunters** - ATV riders and hunters do not get along even though many hunters now use ATVs.
  - ii. **Downward hierarchy of tolerance among land-based trail users – Balkanization of trail users** - While different types of trail users have conflicts, there is less balkanization among trail users here in Idaho than in other places, such as Arizona.
  - iii. **Organized recreation groups versus non-organized group users** - Organized recreation groups tend to have conflicts with non-organized group users. These conflicts include personal water ‘boaters’ where individual users and group users do not get along. **Hierarchy of tolerance among land-based trail users** - Bikers also have conflicts with recreationists accompanied by dogs, and the bikers have conflicts with horseback riders.
  - iv. **Inter-generational and intercultural tensions get manifested in recreation activities**- Some conflicts are inter-generational (based on age differences), intercultural, etc. Any educational programs that are intended to counter conflicts among recreation users should take demographic differences into consideration.

### **Raw Data still to be analyzed:**

#### **SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups**

## **Pocatello**

### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

4. **How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers hunters etc.*

  - i. **Getting groups together to discuss their disagreements can sometimes lead to more acceptable solutions to their differences** - Conflicts are inevitable in multiple use situations. Those conflicts that are typical are:  
Snowmobilers and mountain bikers versus hikers

Motorbikers versus hikers

Skiers versus snowmobilers and

ATV users versus users of four wheelers on the road.

At Mink Creek, an attempt was made at programming alternate schedules of use of the same resource by different types of users. Each group could use the resource every other day. This ultimately led users to come together and find common ground in an agreement. Getting the groups together to talk over their disagreements can sometimes lead to solutions to their differences, even though not always.

- ii. **Set the expectations about the other types of users likely to be sharing multiple use resources, through educational techniques and signage** - Signage should be designed to set the expectations of which other users one is likely to meet on a particular trail or route. This can inoculate the various users to the possibility of meeting others and prepare them to share the resource.
- iii. **Connectivity of trails reduces switching back on the same trails - and meeting other users coming from the opposite direction** - Connectivity of trails is an essential to help reduce conflicts. It reduces the need for all users to switch back on the same trails and have to confront all the other users coming in the opposite direction. One big question is: Are ATVs allowed on gravel roads? While they may cause conflicts with other types of vehicles on gravel roads, these roads can serve as connectors among trails.

**4. How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers hunters etc.*

**Challis**

*Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

- i. **OHV hunters versus recreationists on foot and on horseback** - There are problems between OHV hunters and recreationists on foot and on horseback. Essentially, it is a problem of right of way and the correct etiquette involved when motorized and non-motorized users meet. The principal sources of conflict include:

Noise -The noise of the motorized users impacts the non-motorized users. A reduction of the sound of motorized vehicles could contribute to a reduction in conflict. Manufacturers should be a part of the solution to this issue, even though it appears that they are already attempting to address excessive emissions and noise.

Excessive speed -Excessive speed by motorized users is another source of risk, and therefore conflict. In this case, even non-motorized vehicles like

bicycles can also create a problem with recreationists on foot or on horseback. Creating a speed limit for different types of vehicles, especially when they are in the proximity of people, could be helpful.

## **Lewiston**

### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

#### **4. How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers, hunters, etc.*

- i. **Set the expectations about the other types of users likely to be sharing multiple use resources, through educational techniques and signage** - Users expectations upon arrival determine whether there will be conflicts with other users. There arose conflict between mountain bikers and horse riders for the first time at Hells Gate State Park last year. It appears that greater use of limited resources (more users on both sides) was at the root of the conflict.
- ii. **The provision of more access for motorized recreation could meet the surging demand and reduce conflicts** - Access for motorized recreation is limited and this creates conflict. The provision of more access for motorized recreation could help meet the rising demand and reduce conflict in this region.
- iii. **Perennial polarization between motorized and non-motorized recreationists and lack of consistent operation guidelines and trail designation information foster conflict** - There is tremendous polarization between motorized and non-motorized recreationists. The lack of common rules, trail designation information and consistent operation guidelines that apply across the boundaries of the various land management types or ORMVs, adds to the problems of conflict and enforcement.  
**Designate segregated areas for different recreation activities** - Segregating motorized and non-motorized users may be helpful in reducing conflict.
- iv. **More enforcement for motorized user constraints could reduce tensions** - Potlatch creates forums in which it talks to users about the correct use of the resource. If motorized users would stay on motorized trails, they wouldn't be so disliked. There needs to be more enforcement for motorized user constraints.
- v. **A comprehensive education outreach program can at least, minimize conflicts - OHV education program coupled with licensing and good signage** - Some sort of OHV education, as well as improved signage and licensing are needed, together with consistent law enforcement.
- vi. **Encourage self-policing through grassroots groups to improve rule enforcement-OHVs** - All groups should be encouraged to assume responsibility for their actions on the resource. Some grassroots OHV groups are working to respond to the problems of enforcement of the rules.

- vii. **Recreation providers should work out ‘common ground’ rules of operation** - Even though provider turf battles cannot be ruled out as part of the cause of conflict, it is more of the problem of operating under different laws. For example, the Corp of Army Engineers cannot enforce state law. However, providers could search for “common ground” in their rules of operation, then seek out the outliers/anomalies, and try to work out uniform signage and rules.

**4. How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers hunters etc.*

**Twin Falls**

*Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

- i. **Mountain bikers versus hikers** - Mountain bikers have conflicts with hikers.
- ii. **Designate segregated areas for different recreation activities** -Setting out designated areas for each group may help reduce conflicts.
- iii. **Encourage self-policing of groups to improve rule enforcement** - Empowering groups to do some self-management often works by improving the enforcement of rules and controlling conflicts.
- iv. **Involve user groups in planning facilities and programs to catch conflicts early** - Letting the user groups get more say and involvement in planning facilities and programs promotes conflict reduction, as they can point out possible conflict areas before they occur.
- v. **Getting groups together to discuss their disagreements can sometimes lead to more acceptable solutions to their differences** - When agency staff engage in mediation facilitation processes and bring user groups together for a dialogue, this provides avenues for better opportunities for problem/conflict resolution than when the agents of the department issue judgments one way or the other as solutions to conflicts. Different types of user groups sharing the same resource often have more in common than they realize. They can often resolve their conflicts if exposed to the issues of the other user groups, rather than simply hearing from the agency alone. The efforts of the Winter Coalition at conflict resolution through dialogue should serve as a model.
- vi. **Resource managers need to have guiding principles indicating the ultimate outcome ideas that guide their decision-making, especially in resolving conflicts** - While users should make suggestions and contribute input on resource recreation decisions, land managers need to have guiding principles and to take responsibility for the decisions they make. Consequently, the land managers need to state an ultimate outcome idea that will guide their decision-making.
- vii. **Resource managers should beware of quick fixes under political pressure on issues of conflict** - With resource issues, politicians and their political calculations often interfere with the process of decision-making. Their influence

may lead to quick fixes that open or close a facility here and there but really side-step the issue, satisfy no one, and fail to achieve intended results. Land managers thus need extra doses of patience, realizing that it is a long process. Resource managers and user groups would do well to work together toward common goals rather than seeking fleeting political solutions.

- viii. **The use of social science research by IDPR to study the issues surrounding conflict in recreation is a good idea** - The social science research approach being adopted by IDPR to disentangle these issues through grounded research is a good and unbiased way of tackling these issues.

#### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

- 4. **How well do diverse recreationists get along in this region when they jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers, hunters etc.*

#### **Idaho Falls**

##### *Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

- i. **Mountain bikers versus ATV users** - At first, mountain bikers and ATV users got along very well because the activities of the ATV users pounded down and smoothed out the trails for the mountain bikers. However, the latter soon observed that the ATV activity was cutting up the natural scenery with pioneer trails and causing resource damage. The mountain bikers did not appreciate that. The potential for conflict between these two user groups is now high.
- ii. **Cross country skiers versus snowmobilers** - There are many more cross country skiers than snowmobilers at the Teton Canyon area (100 to 1), and conflict between the two groups is brewing.
- iii. **Backcountry skiers versus snowmobilers** - Backcountry skiers have been getting conflicts with snowmobilers on Forest Service lands at Teton Pass, as snowmobilers created avalanches and thus displaced both backcountry and cross-country skiers. Fist fights sometimes occurred.
- iv. **Getting groups together to discuss their disagreements can sometimes lead to more acceptable solutions to their differences** – In the case above in which the backcountry and cross-country skiers had confrontations with snowmobilers on Forest Service lands at Teton Pass, an ethics meeting was convened of all the groups involved and the concerns of each group were discussed. This led to the thrashing out of some of the issues, and relations among the groups improved. The technique of bringing groups together to discuss issues that are potential sources of conflict can therefore enhance inter-recreationist harmony. Conflicts sometimes arise because each user group has no experience of the needs of the other group. “Each user group needs to walk in each other’s shoes” in order to better understand what constitutes a disruption of their recreation activities.



- v. **Encourage stickers for dog sledges** - Dog sledges have started buying snowmobile stickers. This should be encouraged as it establishes the confines of their activity sites, reducing possible conflicts while bringing in more revenue.
- vi. **Perennial polarization between motorized and non-motorized recreationists and lack of consistent operation guidelines and trail designation information foster conflict** - The usual conflict between motorized and non-motorized resource recreationists persists here.
- vii. **Designate segregated areas for different recreation activities** - Segregated areas of operation have worked quite well in the Island Park area. Island Park permits motorized recreation while Heyman Park does not. So cross-country skiers and snowmobilers operate in separate locations and little conflict results.
- viii. **Extreme skiers versus traditional backcountry skiers** - Conflicts also arise between extreme skiers and traditional backcountry skiers. While the backcountry serves as a solitude setting for the traditional backcountry skiers, it only provides risky 'skiscapes' for the extreme skiers to navigate and get their thrills from. They can therefore be very loud even in the backcountry setting, and this can be disruptive of the traditional backcountry skiing experience.
- ix. **Speed differential conflicts, even among non-motorized recreationists** - Among non-motorized recreationists as well, there are conflicts that may result from speed differentials or other types of incompatibilities. In Harriman, mountain bikers and equestrians often come into conflict. The mountain bikers fear that horses can cause a commotion as bikers approached, because they are not conditioned to bikers. Horses however do appear to acclimatize quite quickly to new situations.

4. a. **What, if any, issues do you see when diverse recreationists jointly use the same recreation sites/resources?**

*Think of such recreationists as ATV riders, Snowmobilers, motorcyclists, cross-country skiers, trail hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, trail bikers hunters etc.*

**TAG**

*Possible Conflicts Among Recreationists*

- i. **Sense of entitlement by some users** - When users pay for access, some assume a sense of entitlement about all sorts of access. For example, when the fee for one type recreation activity is more than the fee for another, the higher paying users demand more privileged access. Others who volunteer to work on trails become excessively possessive of the trails and want to push other users around.
- b. **How would you go about solving those problems?**
- ii. **Resource managers need to have guiding principles indicating the ultimate outcome ideas that guide their decision-making, especially in resolving**

- conflicts** - Management needs to take a stand at some point, guided by some pre-established mission-driven principles, and take decisive decision under conflicted circumstances.
- iii. **Set the expectations about the other types of users likely to be sharing multiple use resources, through educational techniques and signage** - Management also need to provide more education about sharing recreation sites with other users and tolerating them.

### **SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups**

- Question 5** – a. Where would you Locate a New State Park in Idaho if Funding were Available for one?
- b. Why would you Locate it There?

### **Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. A water access park. (6)
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. A park that holistically blends different recreation opportunity sets, and promotes fair access by filling in voids of recreation opportunities locally (Eastern Idaho deserves a new state park for that reason. (3)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. A dunes park. (2)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. An RV park. (2)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. An OHV park. (2)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Instead of a new state park, use the money to maintain the existing parks and the trail system. (2)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. A park that allows for a partnership with another land management agency such as BLM or the Lands Department. (2)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A heritage (historical theme) park. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A non-motorized river park. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A horse-friendly camping park with stables. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. An urban dog park (where people can walk and train their dogs off-leash).(1)
- 9<sup>th</sup>. Emerging urban sports (skateboarding, snowboarding, BMX tracks and bowling greens). (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A shooting range at Hells Gate, in partnership with Fish and Game. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A centennial park between Hells Gate and Dworshak. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A wildlife and other nature interpretation park (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. A mountain park (Cregg Mountain as a state park). (1)

### **Details of Responses to Question 5 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

- 5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the CDA area:

**a. Where?**

- i. A **whitewater kayaking park** on the **Spokane River**.
- ii. A **shooting range park** at **Hells Gate**, in partnership with Fish and Game.
- iii. A **water resources base** around which **campsites and hiking themes** are woven is needed in Idaho, and Kootenai county can provide them.
- iv. A **skateboarding, snowboarding, bowling greens or BMX tracks park** for urban populations of the CDA/Spokane area, where there is demand.
- v. A park that provides for the **urban need for dog parks**.
- vi. A **horse-friendly camping park** with **stable facilities**.
- vii. A park that allows the **holistic blending of recreation opportunity sets** in the area (complementing existing opportunities), irrespective of who owns or manages which resource.

**b. Why?**

-The usual tendency of associating the need for parks with the size of the neighboring population is flawed because that the population does not necessarily recreate where it resides, and the parks and facilities need to be placed where the recreation takes place. Much of the population of Spokane recreates in Kootenai County and so that population should actually be included in the recreation community of Kootenai, which makes it similar to the recreation community of Ada County.

-Since 9/11, resource recreation has gained a higher profile as people have shunned more urbanized or exotic recreation destinations. Kootenai County has been a beneficiary of this increased demand and needs to increase its supply of resource recreation in the form of a new park.

- A whitewater theme and kayaking as recreation activities would be a good addition to the offerings of resource recreation in Idaho as a whole, and the Spokane River has the right attributes in Kootenai County for such a park to be located on it.
- A shooting range is a big draw in terms of existing demand for recreation activities. The Hells Gate area would be a good location for it, and partnering with Fish and Game in such a project would enhance its feasibility.
- Campsites, water resources and hiking are all important thematic factors in guiding the creation of a new park in Idaho and Kootenai County has a lot of that. The new park could come about by creating a completely new park site or by expanding a current recreation site and upgrading it to park status.
- Skateboarding, snowboarding, bowling greens and BMX tracks are activity options that are gaining in prominence and for which there may be a need to create facilities such as parks. The current focus group process is commendable because it allows planning discussions that break the mold of just concentrating on doing what we have always done, without considering the possibility of innovation and fresh ideas on how parks should develop.
- There is not much attention paid to the need for dog parks, where people can walk and train their dogs. They end up having to go long distances to walk their dogs. If a new park is going to look at urban issues, this would be an important issue to consider.
- People also travel with horses sometimes and end up having nowhere to stay due to lack of stables. Stable facilities could therefore be important if a new park includes camping activities.
- Recreation providers often think of the provision of recreation in relation to who owns or manages which resource and who will be in a position to provide which type of recreation. It is important for providers to attempt to view the provision of recreation from the perspective of the recreationist, whose principal concern is that the facilities exist to provide the type of recreation they seek at the level of quality that they want, irrespective of who manages those facilities. If providers understand this, they will see that the seamless integration of all recreation opportunities of an area into a more holistic opportunity set is more beneficial to both the providers and the recreationists.

## **McCall**

### *Where to Site a New State Park*

#### **5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the McCall area:

- a. Where?**
  - i. **Eagle Park** should be developed into a **wildlife interpretation park**.
  - ii. The **Horsethief Reservoir** would be a good candidate for a new state park.
  - iii. The **Eastshore of the Payette** and the **North Fork corridor** are good places to consider for a new state park.
  - iv. Somewhere **along the Salmon River or Little Salmon** should be considered as a prime location for a new state park.

- v. A **non-motorized river park** (for kayaking etc.) would be a good addition to the park system.
- vi. The **Steck Park** would be a good candidate for a new state park, and it should be **bundled with the paving of the road** as well, **using rural economic development funds**.
- vii. An **RV state park** should be established.
- viii. An **OHV park** would also be a good thing to consider.

**b. Why?**

- Wildlife interpretation is an activity that needs to become more available in the state, and Eagle Park would serve that purpose very well as a state park.
- We are not creating any new shoreline for public use and yet these resources are in demand. In considering the establishment of a new state park, the concept of adding new shoreline for recreational purposes should be a priority. A new state park with a river or reservoir shoreline would therefore be desirable.
- An RV park is lacking in the system, and this could be a good opportunity to establish one.
- An OHV park would also be a good thing to consider.
- A non-motorized river state park would be a good addition to the park system. Besides adding new shoreline, non-motorized recreation activities get less attention than the motorized ones, and this would be an improvement to the state park system. Many of the rivers mentioned above such as the Salmon, the North Fork or the Payette could be good locations for a non-motorized river state park.

**Boise**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

**5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Boise area:

**a. Where?**

- i. **Weiser dunes** would be a suitable location for a new state park.
- ii. The **Palissades reservoir** is a possible location for a new state park.
- iii. **Cregg mountain** would be another possible option for creating a new state park.
- iv. Considering possible locations outside of the Ada County region, **eastern Idaho** would be a good area to locate a new state park.

**b. Why?**

-Weiser dunes would be a suitable location because many people go there already. Besides, multiple use opportunities exist there, such as hiking, water recreation activities, etc. The fact that the railroad is located between the water and the dunes could be a problem that will need fixing.

-The Palissades reservoir is a good location, since water access recreation activities are not growing. In that connection, Big Bar would be a good setting for a state park with a focus on whitewater and flat water recreation activities.

-Eastern Idaho would be a good area to locate a new state park because they have fewer such opportunities currently.

## **Pocatello**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

### **5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Pocatello area:

#### **a. Where?**

- i. Many **recreation areas run by the Department of Lands** would be appropriate for establishing a new state park. The **Chesterfield town site** would be a good site for a new **tourism-oriented state park**.
- ii. An **ATV type park** would be good, with parking areas, motor cross section and trails.

#### **b. Why?**

-The appropriateness of the Chesterfield town site is mainly due to the fact that it already attracts tourists to the site.

- While an ATV type park may look feasible here, it is very likely that it will be visiting outsiders, rather than local residents, who would be more willing to pay to use such facilities, and who would also be more willing to follow the rules. The question then is: For whom would the state park be created if this type of park is created? Would it be for in-state or out-of-state users? Which groups would be better served? Are we trying to solve a problem or create a destination site for tourism?

## **Challis**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

### **5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Challis area:

#### **a. Where?**

- i. The **Bayhorse area** would be a location for creating a state park.

- ii. **Anywhere** that the new park will **fill in a void of recreational opportunities.**

**b. Why?**

-Heritage themes are not very many in the state park system.  
-Fairness in access to recreation opportunities should be the guiding principle, in establishing a new park. A new state park should therefore seek to plug in the gaps at locations where recreation opportunities are lacking.

**Lewiston**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

- 5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Lewiston area:

**a. Where?**

- i. Create the **centennial park** in the area between **Hells Gate and Dworshak.**
- ii. Why not **use the money to maintain the good parks that we already have?**
- iii. Use the **money to expand and improve the trail system.**

**b. Why?**

-This region (north central Idaho, especially the Riggins – Lewiston area) is where all recreation in Idaho starts.  
-The centennial park could be called the “Clearwater River State Park”, and it would be a linear park from Orofino to Lewiston, with a trail. This park was originally proposed as the centennial state park, running from Kooskia or Kamiah to Lewiston.

**Twin Falls**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

- 5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Twin Falls area:

**a. Where?**

- i. An **RV park** would be the most desirable type of new state park in this region, and the RV campground near Hailey/Ketchum area is a good candidate for conversion into a new state park.
- ii. The **Sand Peak park** would also be a good candidate.

- iii. Developing **Billingson Creek** into a state park would be a good idea.

**b. Why?**

- The south valley area is where the population is moving to, and so that would be a good location for a new state park.
- The Sand Peak park would be a good candidate because it is BLM property and the BLM already wants to off load it on to the county. The BLM is even willing to help with funding in order to make its off load idea more palatable. There would therefore be few acquisition costs.
- Billingson Creek would be a resource management, hands-on park, since many visitors are already coming there.

**Idaho Falls**

*Where to Site a New State Park*

**5. If the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation had funding for a new state park, where do you think it should be built and why?**

Choices made at the Idaho Falls area:

**a. Where?**

- i. Somewhere along the **South Fork** would be a good location for a new state park.
- ii. The **St Anthony Sand Dunes** should be considered as a possible location for a new state park.
- iii. Irrespective of whichever location is selected for a new state park, **partnering with another agency**, like the BLM, in the creation of a new park would be a winner.

**b. Why?**

- The South Fork would be a good location because it is good for fishing.
- The caveat concerning the St Anthony Sand Dunes is that the establishment of a state park would push out certain recreation users such as hunters.



### **SCORTP Regional Recreation Provider Focus Groups**

**Question 6 – a.** Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?

–Explain why you feel that way

### **Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Non-motorized activities generally are not getting their fair share of attention in public recreation investment. 3
- 1<sup>st</sup>. Create a water endowment fund to purchase recreation rights and invest in water storage for recreation. 3
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Lobbying needed at the state level, as little attention is given by the Idaho State Legislature to state recreation issues. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Public funding for recreational investments should be based less on the size of the resident population, and more on which sites bear the brunt of recreational impacts. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Public recreation investment should promote a fair share of economic development in the rural areas. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Boards for wildlife viewing are a neglected public recreation investment area. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Funding or public investment in recreation activities should be sensitive to intra-activity segmentation of user needs. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Boater's registration fees are too low, but the ability of users to designate primary and secondary use areas is good. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Funding or public investment in recreation activities should be sensitive to differences in needs based on intra-activity segmentation. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Investment in shooting ranges is needed. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Public recreation investments are excessively driven by the capacity of recreation activities to generate revenue. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Funding for public recreation investment in federal land management agencies is inadequate. Federal agencies try to do more with less. 1

- 4<sup>th</sup>. Agencies should search for more creative revenue-boosting recreation investment strategies. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Shortage of winter trail recreation for the transients in the Challis area needs to be addressed. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Investment in natural history interpretation of the unique geology and flora of the area is needed around the Challis area is needed. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. IDPR has an unfair monopoly of some LWCF grant money.1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Lobbying is needed at a national level for an expanded share of LWCF funds for the states. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. There is unfair neglect of investments for ATV activities. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Education programs get short changed in funding and investment. 1
- 4<sup>th</sup>. There is little funding for enforcement of recreation regulations. 1

### **Details of Responses to Question 6 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

##### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

- 6. Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the CDA area:

- i. **Public funding for recreational investments should be based less on the size of the resident population, and more on which sites bear the brunt of recreational impacts** - Urban dwellers tend to use rural resources and areas for recreation, and yet those rural areas do not get the needed funding to counter the resultant impacts. Basing the distribution of funding for recreational investments on the size of the resident population does injustice to these rural areas that bear the brunt of the recreational impacts and yet do not get enough compensation for it.
- ii. **Public recreation investment should promote a fair share of economic development in the rural areas** - The Governor's rural economic initiative is aimed at promoting a fair share of economic development in the rural areas, and public recreation investments could be good means of doing this, since much recreation occurs in these areas.
- iii. **Boards for wildlife viewing are a neglected public recreation investment area** - Building boards for wildlife viewing tends to be a neglected area.
- iv. **Boater's registration fees are too low, but the ability of users to designate primary and secondary use areas is a good thing** - Boater's registration fees need to be increased. The existing arrangement whereby boaters are able to designate primary and secondary use areas is good.
- v. **Funding or public investment in recreation activities should be sensitive to differences in needs based on intra-activity segmentation (type of use/types of equipment used/levels of experience, etc.)** -When it comes to funding or public

investment in recreation activities, the idea of viewing activity types generically, without distinguishing between the patronage levels of its more subtle segments is not fair. For the sake of planning recreation development and the mitigation of impacts, participants in activities may sometimes need to be segmented by type of use/by equipment used/by experience etc. For example, fly fishing versus other type of fishing, hill-climbing snowmobilers versus cross-country snowmobilers and so on. By the type of equipment used, non-motorized boating can be segmented into kayaking versus canoeing versus tubing. In the case of segmentation by experience level, the needs of dedicated bird-watchers are not exactly the same as those of regular tourists who also embark on a bird-watching experience.

Identifying the needs of distinct segments within user groups of the same activity helps in planning recreation area development and programming. A knowledge of how many boaters haul their boats by car versus those hauling them in by truck or RV to specific a site may give an indication, for example, of the parking space requirements at that site for cars versus trucks or RVs.

Public recreation investments that are generic by recreation activity rather than taking into account the different investment types needed for different user segments could fail to address important issues of adequacy and quality of supply needed to meet the demands in specific segments; or the adequacy of efforts directed at mitigating the impacts created by different segments of the activity.

- vi. **Investment in shooting ranges is needed** -The availability of shooting ranges is a big issue. Hells Gate is a good location for such a facility. It could be established in partnership with the Idaho Fish and Game department.

## **McCall**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

- 6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the McCall area:

- i. **Public recreation investments are excessively driven by the capacity of recreation activities to generate revenue** - The activities that have difficulties paying their way are the ones that are most short-changed. This is particularly true of non-motorized activities at the community level, such as youth sports, whitewater activities and non-motorized trail activities.

## **Boise**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Boise area:

- i. **Funding for public recreation investment in federal land management agencies is inadequate. They try to do more with less** -BLM is trying to convince Congress that they do more than what appropriations allow.
- ii. **Agencies should search for more creative revenue-boosting recreation investment strategies** –“We need to get out of the entitlement mentality. Studies on ‘willingness to pay’ need to be conducted to see what options exist to expand our revenue base”.

### **Pocatello**

#### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Pocatello area:

- i. **Non-motorized activities generally are not getting their fair share of attention in public recreation investment** -There is a lack of maintenance of non-motorized trails, and non-motorized activities generally are not getting their fair share of attention in public investment recreation facilities and programs.
- ii. **Water-based opportunities are neglected or ignored in the southeast of Idaho** -Water-based opportunities are neglected or ignored in the southeast of Idaho. More attention should be put in maintaining minimum flows and minimum pools, but the political will is lacking.
- iii. **Investment in water storage and coordination with water users needed** -Where you store water is key for recreation. More coordination with water users is needed to work those issues out.
- iv. **Invest in water storage and create a water endowment fund to purchase recreation rights for recreation** -Perhaps we could create a water endowment fund with which we could purchase recreation rights.

## **Challis**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Challis area:

- i. **Shortage of winter trail recreation for the transients in the Challis area -**  
Winter trail recreation for the transients passing through is seriously handicapped here in terms of the gap between the need and the availability of trails, grooming activity, and the ability to tap into grant funds to engage in these types of projects.
- ii. **Investment in natural history interpretation of the unique geology and flora of the area is needed around Challis -**This area has a unique natural environment, especially in relation to its flora, and the fact that it is the center of geological activity. But little is done to encourage natural history interpretation. Attention to interpretation could be both an educational and management tool for resource protection. Typically, people do not know they need interpretation until they have a good interpretation program.

## **Lewiston**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Lewiston area:

- i. **Unfair monopoly of some LWCF grant money by IDPR -**There could be a case for IDPR having to compete more with other programs and agencies for LWCF money. The other state agencies should be able to compete for the 50% of the LWCF funds that go to IDPR every year. The state should take a maximum of 50% (including their administrative costs) and leave 50% of the total for the cities/counties/others (the local entities side of the pie).

- ii. **Lobbying needed at a national level for an expanded share of LWCF funds for the states** -There is a need to lobby for more funding of the states through the LWCF. When it comes to the federal side of LWCF money, no changes are needed.
- iii. **Lobbying needed at the state level, as little attention is given by the Idaho State Legislature to state recreation issues** -The State legislature is not paying attention to state recreation issues.

## **Twin Falls**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

- 6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Twin Falls area:

- i. **Non-motorized activities generally are not getting their fair share of attention in public recreation investment** - Non-motorized recreation is not getting much attention in public recreation investment. Regarding where the funding sources could come from, what about creating a non-motorized license plate?

## **Idaho Falls**

### *Fair Share of Public Investments*

- 6. **Do you believe that the recreation activity(ies) that you provide (please name it/them), gets a fair share of attention (in terms of public investment in facilities, personnel, programs, the level of fees charged etc.), when compared to other recreation activities?**

**–Explain why you feel that way.**

Choices made at the Idaho Falls area:

- i. **Unfair neglect of investment attention for ATV activities** -ATV activity does not get a fair share of attention in terms of investment in facilities, programs and personnel.
- ii. **Education programs get short changed in funding and investment** -There is not as much investment in education programs as there should be.
- iii. **Little funding for enforcement** -Enforcement of regulations gets less attention in funding and personnel than other areas, especially in Island Park.
- iv. **Non-motorized activities generally are not getting their fair share of attention in public recreation investment** -IDPR is biased in favor of motorized activities when it comes to paying attention to recreation activities and investing resources

and efforts into them. Trails are a clear-cut example of how motorized activities get the lion's share of the attention.

\*-Environmental groups scoping----- . It is often left to non-governmental groups to find funding for maintaining and improving facilities for non-motorized activities.

**Question 7** – a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?

**Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Where one-on-one communication with users is possible, like in the parks, or at the points of contact at which visitors can get information from staff (especially if these points are not too far from recreation sites), communication is much better between providers and users. 6
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. IDPR, as a possible information broker between providers and recreationists, could provide some quality control over recreation information publications and forums for discussion among provider, and provider/recreationists out reach. 5
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Communication with motorized recreationists is poor. Regional information 'guides' are needed at such facilities as designated ATV riding areas. 3
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Communications are easier with users who belong to associations or clubs. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Use education tools like games, activities and programming to improve communications between providers and recreationists. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Mixed performance of agencies in communicating their message to users. Communications with hunters are generally superior. 2
- 4<sup>th</sup>. A variety of communication methods are required for providers to reach different user groups. 2
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Improved websites and digitalization of information documents help enhance communications. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Providers have good communications with specialized groups, but not with each others' groups. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Poor signage and vandalism interrupt communication. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Communication should give greater prominence to the concept of educating users about possible impacts. 1



- 8<sup>th</sup>. Communication between providers and local user groups, and among the local groups themselves is better than communication with, and among visiting outsiders. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. “Empty nesters” are more accessible for communication purposes. 1
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Besides working with outfitters, the Idaho Travel Council should also partner with local recreation providers to create joint publicity content that is up-to-date. 1

### **Details of Responses to Question 7 in each Region**

(The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number):

#### **CDA**

*Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

- 7. a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the CDA area:

- i. **Communications are easier with users who belong to associations or clubs** - Communications are more fluid in situations where user groups have associations or clubs. Such associations tend to have better funding, have more clout in lobbying and so can make a real difference in the communication process. Non-club/association members are therefore more difficult to reach with messages.
  - ii. **“Empty nesters” are more accessible for communication purposes** - “Empty nesters” tend to be the demographic group that is more accessible in any attempts at communicating information (e.g. for ATVs users). The younger groups are more difficult to reach.
- b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**
- i. **IDPR as a possible good information broker between providers and recreationists** -IDPR would be a good information broker between providers and recreationists such a ATV users. IDPR could also provide education facilities and programs for groups/ clubs/associations, and encourage users, especially the ‘missing’ younger segment of users, to join clubs or associations, to facilitate heeding to communication appeals.
  - ii. **Use games, activities and programming to improve communications** - A game of poker cards has been used successfully to improve the communication of safety information to users. The cards have questions whose correct answers earn the

player safety points, and the safety points will eventually result in hypothetical awards. It has turned out to be an interesting family activity while promoting information about safety.

## **McCall**

### *Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

7.      **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the McCall area:

- i.    **Communication between providers and local user groups, and among the local groups themselves is better than communication with, and among visiting outsiders** - There are many user groups in the communities of Valley county. The communication among them locally is generally good. For example, hunter safety is excellent as a consequence of the good user group communication.  
Generally however, it is outside visitors rather than local residents who dominate the outdoor recreation activities around here. The level of communication among these visitors is not very high.
- ii.   **Studies show mixed performance of Fish and Game in communicating their message to users** - In gap analysis studies done by Fish and Game in their recreation areas, the performance of the agency in communicating the message of their programs to recreationists received mixed ratings. The hunter education program was rated by respondents as being high in both importance and performance. However, they rated communication among users of Fish and Game recreation areas generally as high importance and low performance.
- iii. **In the parks, communication with users is better because it can be one-on-one** - In the parks, communication with visitors is high because it is one on one.

- b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**

- i.    **A variety of communication methods are required for providers to reach different user groups** - The methods of communication used by recreation

providers to inform and educate their clients need to be varied in order to reach different user groups.

## **Boise**

### *Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

7.     **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Boise area:

- i.   **Communications are easier with users who belong to associations or clubs** - The BLM has a better connection with organized user groups. However, it does a poor job communicating with many users who are not affiliated to associations.
- b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**
- i.   **Communication should give greater prominence to the concept of educating users about possible impacts** - Educating users about the impacts their machines have on natural resources is the area where the communication is most important.

## **Pocatello**

### *Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

7.     **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Pocatello area:

- i.   **Communication levels are poor because the points of contact where visitors can get information from staff are far from recreation sites, making**

- documents less available to visitors** - The communication level is not good because the points of contact at which people can get information (location of staff of agencies) are far away from where the recreationists are.
- ii. **Providers have good communications with specialized groups, but not with each others' groups** - When recreation providers specialize in products without developing specialized communication for those products, it does not work. Providers have good communications with specialized groups, but not with each others' groups. There is also miscommunication among private versus public providers, non-motorized trail users versus those who are motorized.

**b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**

- i. **Communication levels are poor because the points of contact where visitors can get information from staff are far from recreation sites, making documents less available to visitors** - The staff of agencies who are the sources of information for visitors need to go out there and meet the recreationists rather than wait for them to come to the offices of the agencies, since most users are not stopping in at agency offices.
- ii. **IDPR could provide some quality control over recreation information publications and forums for discussion among providers, and provider/recreationists out reach** - IDPR could help by first getting providers together to jointly produce quality information documentation, and getting them to reach out more to recreationists. There are many printed documents that give information, maps and so on. However, they are often neither created nor supervised by the agencies. Some quality control by IDPR on issues related to recreation information documents in Idaho could be helpful.

**Challis**

*Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

- 7. **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Challis area:

- i. **Mixed performance of agencies in communicating their message to users - Communications with hunters are generally superior** - The level of communication in general needs some work, even though some good efforts are being made. The BLM has a camp post that has been doing hunter education over the last few years, and it is working in communicating required information.
- ii. **Improved websites and digitalization of information documents help enhance**

- communications** - The website of the Forest Service has got better, and they get lots of email through it.
- iii. **Communication levels are poor because the points of contact where visitors can get information from staff are far from recreation sites, making documents less available to visitors** - When users are able, through one means or another, to contact real people in order to ask questions, they get their issues addressed to a greater degree about the conditions the resource, the most appropriate equipment that they need to bring along with them.
  - iv. **Poor signage and vandalism interrupt communication** - Signage often leaves a lot to be desired, even though vandalism makes matters worse.

**b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**

- iii. **Communication levels are poor because the points of contact where visitors can get information from staff are far from recreation sites, making documents less available to visitors** - Making publications, bulletin boards, brochures and maps more readily available would be helpful in communicating information to recreationists.
- ii. **Improved websites and digitalization of information documents help enhance communications** - Often, the recreationists are seeking the information on their own. The availability of updated passive communication sources such as websites can be very useful to those people who are seeking the information. Digitalization of things like maps would make their updating much easier. It is also possible to import downloadable U.S. Geological Service (USGS) maps, that are usually more up to date. The webmasters of such websites need to be in regular touch with local databases and with people who have local knowledge so that all information is current.
- v. **Besides working with outfitters, the Idaho Travel Council should also partner with local recreation providers to create joint publicity content that is up-to-date** -The Idaho Travel Council spends a lot of time with outfitters, but not with destination visitor agencies and agents, such as parks and recreation people, and campground managers, for example. They therefore fail to get the full picture of what destinations have to offer. If they partner with all local recreation providers, promoting the creation of joint brochures, consistent information can be put out there for users.

**Lewiston**

*Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

- 7. **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Lewiston area:

- i. **Where one-on-one communication with users is possible, like in the parks, communication is much better between providers and users** - One-on-one communications between recreationists and the particular provider on whose lands they're recreating on is pretty good. There is a lot of confusion though among users about which provider is managing which resource. There is confusion on the issue of ORMV use and which rules apply where.
- ii. **Communication with motorized recreationists is poor** - There is poor communication with motorized recreationists.
- b. **How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**
- iii. **Regional information 'guides' required on such facilities as designated ATV riding areas** - Service providers could also produce regional recreation information 'guides' (a pamphlet), and perhaps even regional 'tour guides', that disseminate such information as designated ATV riding areas. They should also identify points of contact for the various facilities. The regional recreation information "guide" can be paid for with user fees (registration, ATV fees, etc.). Montana created one and funded it through a portion of the bed tax. The hotel/motel tax in Idaho is only 2%, so a 1% tax could be added to it to fund such a publication.

## **Twin Falls**

*Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

7. a. **How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Especially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Twin Falls area:

- i. **Education as a tool for improving communication between recreation providers and recreationists** - It has been suggested that educating users would be one of the good ways of improving interaction among recreationists and reducing conflicts. Why not extend that idea to communication between recreation providers and recreationists.
- b. **How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**
- ii. **IDPR should promote inter-county forums, inter provider forums, inter user forums, and combinations of these for interactions and discussions to**

**improve communications** -IDPR could create inter county forums for discussions, leading to a network among counties in which issues are discussed.

## **Idaho Falls**

### *Effectiveness of Recreation Provider – Recreationist Communication*

7. **a. How good is the level of communication between recreation providers in this region and recreationists?**

*Epecially address issues of site regulations, risks/safety issues, and the responsibilities that recreationists should have toward other participants in certain recreation activities, etc?*

Choices made at the Idaho Falls area:

- i. **Slower moving recreation types recreationists (e.g. non-motorized) tend to read trail information signs more than fast moving motorized recreation types** - According to Forest Service staff, the slower moving recreation types like backpackers and equestrians do get time to stop and read trail information signs. The biggest dearth of communication occurs with the faster moving motorized recreation types, who have less capability to stop and read signs.
  - ii. **ATV riders lack connecting loops and up-to-date maps on that information** - ATV riders complain about a lack of loops and up-to-date maps.
  - iii. **Solitude seeking backcountry skiers and wilderness hikers differ in their responses to signage from the ‘herd mentality’ of snowmobilers and ATV riders. Variety in communications needed to reach all** -Backcountry skiers and wilderness hikers are solitude seekers, while snowmobilers and ATV riders are more like herd animals who often congregate in large numbers that keep growing as the activity progresses. The same message or type of signage can hardly reach these diverse types of groups at the same level of intensity. Bigger signs are needed for motorized trails to facilitate reading while moving fast.
- b. How could the quality of communication between the providers and the recreationists be improved?**
- iv. **Communication levels are poor because the points of contact where visitors can get information from staff are far from recreation sites, making documents less available to visitors** - The use of ticketing for violations and

having agency staff readily available to talk to recreationists at the resource was seen as contributing to reducing trespassing.

However, the shutting down of the ranger stations at weekends on Forest Service lands is not helping to effectively communicate with recreationists and to reduce rule violations.

- Question 8** – a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by IDPR?  
b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.

**Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic:**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Difficulty figuring out where to get specific data in IDPR. A one-stop data shopping area is needed. 2
- 1<sup>st</sup>. Access to specialized staff at the regions improves their value. 2
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Insufficient law enforcement personnel. 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Let the grants fiscal year match the federal fiscal year. 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Are cabins at Hells Gate worth the investment expense? 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Out-of-control noxious weeds on the bike trail at Hells Gate State Park. 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Put seasonal trail rangers to work in the shoulder seasons. 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Invest in the resources and facilities, not just in people (staff/users). 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Users should be informed about how their fees are used. 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. The new structure of IDPR is not yet fully understood by people outside the department for them to make a judgment on efficiency 1
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Great Job. 1



**Details of Responses to Question 2 in each Region** (The **bold numbers** to the left are the question number. The numbers that are not bold refer to the number of each topic as shown on page one):

**CDA**

*Efficiency of Resource Use by IDPR*

**8.a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**

**8.b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**

- i. **The new structure of IDPR is not yet fully understood by people outside the department** - The reorganized structure of IDPR is still not fully comprehensible to outsiders. So it is difficult to know about levels of efficiency and inefficiency.
- ii. **Access to specialized staff at the regions improves their value** - There is however a need for greater efficiency in the use of staff. It was the visits with Jim Poulsen, former N. Region Grants Specialist, that were helpful in dealing with issues directly with him.  
The current presence of ORTS staff and grants staff in each region is a good move toward a more efficient use of staff in this sense.
- iii. **Insufficient law enforcement personnel** - The current level of use of law enforcement personnel is not efficient because it does not permit them to deal effectively with a number of issues like the trail loops in Challis. A law enforcement policy which is more integrated with (county) peace officers could be more productive.

**McCall**

**8. a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**

- i. **Difficulty figuring out where to get specific data in IDPR** - It is difficult to know where to go to get specific data on Idaho recreation within IDPR.

**b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**

- ii. **A one-stop data shopping area is needed** - A one-stop shopping area for data is needed within the department.

#### **Boise**

- 8.
  - a. **Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**
  - b. **If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**
- i. **Put seasonal trail rangers to work in the shoulder seasons** - The trail rangers who are seasonal employees could be put to work in the shoulder seasons.

#### **Pocatello**

- 8.
  - a. **Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**
  - b. **If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**
- i. **Let the grants fiscal year match the federal fiscal year** - There is a fiscal year mismatch with the federal fiscal year for grants. If the grants were published to match with the fiscal year of the other agencies, that would allow them more time to prepare their proposals for the grants.  
Maybe making grants 18 months would help.
- ii. **Invest in the resources and facilities, not just in people** - Don't dump all the money into people. Put some of it on the ground, into resource and facility improvement.

#### **Challis**

- 8.
  - a. **Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**
  - b. **If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**
- i. **Difficulty figuring out where to get specific data in IDPR** - Some data gathering efforts by IDPR have gone nowhere eventually. Other times, other agencies like the Forest Service or BLM has sent data to IDPR because it was going to be used for some purpose, and then nothing happens.  
Using seasonals to gather data without a central location where it will eventually be sent and used may be part of the reason why some data gathering goes nowhere.  
Other times, it is the problems involved in meshing up the software of different agencies that make data not compatible with that of other agencies and so not transferable to other agencies.
- ii. **Access to specialized staff at the regions improves their value** - It is often not easy to find out who is in charge of certain projects in IDPR, especially after personnel changes have occurred. Hence people in other agencies have difficulties in knowing whom to talk to.

Perhaps, each year, IDPR should send its phone directory of who is doing what to the other agencies.

### **Lewiston**

8.     **a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**  
       **b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**
- i.   **Great Job** - They are doing a great job.
  - ii.   **Are cabins at Hells Gate worth the investment expense?** – There is a question mark on the building of the cabins at Hells Gate State Park. It is a niche market and not for the general user. So the investment may not be worth it. The cabins are however being consistently used at Dworshak State Park with positive public comments. So the cabin market may not be that exclusive every where after all.
  - iii.   **Out-of-control noxious weeds on the bike trail at Hells Gate State Park** - Who is in charge of noxious weeds along the bike trail at Hells Gate State Park? Noxious weeds are out of control there and there is a need to control them better.

### **Twin Falls**

8.     **a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**  
       **b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**

None

### **Idaho Falls**

8.     **a. Have you seen any evidence of inefficient use of resources by the IDPR?**  
       **b. If yes, please give a further explanation of the circumstances.**
- i.   **Need to know where fees go** - The payers for stickers should be informed of the percentage of their sticker fee that comes back to support their activity.

### **Recreation Providers**

9. If you could do just one thing to drastically improve recreation in Idaho, what would it be?

### **Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic (Recreation Providers):**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. IDPR should assume a leadership role in creating a statewide multi-land management agency partnership to jointly address recreation planning that focuses on regional-based management  
Systematic and regular meetings of heads and senior staff of land management agencies should be held to strategize on SCORTP-led inter-agency recreation planning and collaboration.
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Give issues related to the funding (and staffing) of recreation a higher profile.
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Increase/improve public access to water recreation, and access to the public lands for recreational purposes  
The emphasis was put on access to water recreation
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Create educational/information programs on ethical OHV trail use, and support the launching of a more general national campaign to educate the general public on the land use ethic.
- 5<sup>th</sup>. Adopt more aggressive marketing techniques to sell the benefits of outdoor recreation to the public and to decision makers (*compare the marketing style of the YMCA, with video testimonials*).
- 6<sup>th</sup>. Preserve open spaces that are accessible to the public, and available for organized group activities, especially since private developers are gobbling up the best lands
- 7<sup>th</sup>. IDPR should coordinate the development of operational guidelines for trails, from a regional perspective (*internal regional connectivity*)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. IDPR should promote more effective management of reservoir water storage (*storing more water downstream in the Chesterfield dam rather than upstream would provide more recreation opportunities, without negatively impacting farm needs further downstream* )
- 9<sup>th</sup>. Studies on the economic impact of recreation on Idaho should be a priority.

- 10<sup>th</sup>. Riparian greenways should be developed. For example, a comprehensive management plan for the Boise River is a necessity.
- 11<sup>th</sup>. Design simple, up-to-date, inclusive recreation maps for all land management agency areas.
- 12<sup>th</sup>. Create close-to-home middle level skill trail systems to improve community connectivity.

## **TAG**

**Question 9** – If you could do just one thing to drastically improve recreation in Idaho, what would it be?

### **Overall of Ranking of number of comments per topic (TAG):**

**9. If you could do just one thing to drastically improve recreation in Idaho, what would it be?**

Answers:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. Education/outreach and interpretation. (10)
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. Add new facilities and recreation opportunities to improve access. (8)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. Establish pay equity for recreation employees – better compensation and staffing levels [Tiebreaker 3<sup>rd</sup> position] (3)
- 4<sup>th</sup>. Look for new outside funding of all types for recreation development. [Tiebreaker 4<sup>th</sup> position] (3)
- 5<sup>th</sup>. Beef up internal IDPR infrastructure through maintenance and repair of facilities. [Tiebreaker 5<sup>th</sup> position] (3)
- 6<sup>th</sup>. Foster partnerships with other land management agencies like the Forest service and BLM, and also with user groups. (2)
- 6<sup>th</sup>. Internal/external communication improvement. (1)
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Work to convert current users into repeat users. (1)
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Expand the presence of IDPR in less served areas like the Eastern Region. (1)
- 7<sup>th</sup>. Look for new grant sources to fund recreation development. (1)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Include additional service orientation for new staff. (0)
- 8<sup>th</sup>. Balance resource use and the need for preservation of natural resources, and also to ensure that all use of resources is in moderation. (0)

## **CDA**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

- 9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**
1. A regional planning effort to facilitate a multi-agency partnership in relation to recreation management statewide is called for. It could be on an annual or biennial basis. (7 votes)
  2. Economic impact studies are needed on the impact of recreation activities in Idaho. (4 votes)
  3. Better coordination and communication among public and private providers. IDPR can help facilitate this communication. (2 votes)
  4. A re-evaluation of recreation fees (boating, moorage, registration, parking, launching fees, etc.). (1 vote)
  5. Better information, signage, maps, website and printable maps. (0 votes)

## **McCall**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

- 9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**
1. Systematic and regular meetings of the heads of land management agencies and their senior staff is required for inter-agency recreation provider planning and interaction. Such meetings would also provide a forum for a more strategic examination of recreation policy in the state as a whole, rather than the more common practice of each agency having to react to recreation trends in a narrow mission and turf-based manner. This could help in the building of a broad-based constituency for recreation in the state. Additionally, such inter-agency collaboration in recreation policy should be guided by a determination to let SCORP live in all the agencies as a policy guide for recreation in the state. Then all the concerned agencies should come

- together on a yearly basis to review and update aspects of the SCORTP document. (5 votes)
2. People/staffing and funding for recreation programs needs to assume a higher profile than is currently the case. (4 votes)
  3. Recognition of recreation needs in all agencies. (1 vote)
  4. There is a need for designing an integrated, simplified and inclusive recreation map for all recreation-related land management agencies. (0 votes)
  5. Attention to process (involving recreation providers and users in the formulation of statewide recreation policy), is important in attaining recreation goals. (0 votes)

### **Boise**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

- 9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**
- 1- Cooperation and collaboration efforts across agencies. This is particularly important in relation to environmental education. (4 votes)
  - 2- Preservation of open space that is accessible to the public. (4 votes)
  - 3- A comprehensive river management plan for the Boise River. (3 votes)
  - 4- The provision of O and M facilities. (3 votes)
  - 5- The provision of space for organized recreation. (2 votes)
  - 6- Increase and/or improve water access. (1 vote)
  - 7- Paying closer attention to campground needs. (1 vote)
  - 8- Improve information availability. (0 votes)

### **Pocatello**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

- 9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**
1. Prioritize access to public lands and water recreation. (5 votes)
  2. The creation of more stored water in reservoirs. (2 votes)
  3. Create an outdoor education ethics initiative. (2 votes)
  4. The creation of an OHV park. (2 votes)
  5. Develop water recreation facilities. (1 vote)
  6. Create a Chesterfield State park. (1 vote)
  7. Develop urban fishing facilities. (1 vote)
  8. Work toward the capability to accommodate large groups in all areas. (0 vote)
  9. Encourage private land recreation development. (0 vote)

### **Challis**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

**9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**

1. The provision of free educational information on ethical OHV use on trails. Maps and signage would be important aspects of this (4 votes)
2. Creating a close-to-home middle level skill trail system (2 to 10 miles in length), that helps improve the connectivity of communities. (3 votes)
3. Improve river access to the Big Lost River. (2 votes)
4. An interpretation program. (2 votes)
5. Provide simple area maps on things to do around here. (1 vote).

**Lewiston**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

**9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**

1. Regional trail coordination and development of operational guidelines. (5 votes)
2. Stable acquisition program for land. (3 votes)
3. Maintenance of existing parks. (2 votes)
4. Work with the Department of Commerce to develop a regional recreation opportunities booklet. (1 vote)
5. Develop more riparian greenways. (1 vote)

**Twin Falls**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

**9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**

1. Selling benefits of recreation– Campaigns to influence decision-makers, and using testimonials to personalize the recreation experience and thus to market it to potential patrons. (4 votes)
2. Funding mechanism need emphasis (3 votes)
3. Maintaining public access to public lands through county regulations. (1 vote)
4. Emphasis on partnerships/collaboration with other agencies. (0 votes)

**Idaho Falls**

*Suggest Two Key Factors to Improve Recreation in this Region*

**9. If this region could do only two things to drastically improve the type of recreation that you provide in the region, what should they be?**



1. Planning for growth. (2 votes)
2. Creating designated trails, especially on the lands of the federal land management agencies. (2 votes)
3. Launching a national advertisement campaign on land use ethics. (2 votes)
4. Provision of more community recreation facilities. (1 vote)
5. Provision of readable and updated maps and trail signs. (1 vote)
6. Creating an OHV education program on safety. (1 vote)
7. Increased funding for recreation generally, increased lobbying and representation in support of this goal. (1 vote)
8. Statewide consistency in recreation regulations. (1 vote)
9. The introduction of a kind of sticker for non-motorized recreation users, so as to fund the facilities for such activities. This can be preceded by a 'willingness to pay' study. (1 vote)
10. Continue the Fish and Game policy of seasonal closures and hunting area closures to ATV activities. (Zero votes)

